BIULETYN POLSKIEGO TOWARZYSTWA JĘZYKOZNAWCZEGO

BULLETIN DE LA SOCIÉTÉ POLONAISE DE LINGUISTIQUE

ZESZYT III — FASCICULE III

KRAKÓW 1931
GEBETHNER I WOLFF
WARSZAWA — KRAKÓW — LUBLIN — ŁÓDŹ — POZNAŃ
WILNO — ZAKOPANE
PARIS VIe — 123, Bd ST-GERMAIN

Drukarnia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego pod zarządem Józefa Filipowskiego.

Le langage d'après St. Augustin.

Verbis de verbis agere tam implicatum est, quam digitos digitis inserere et confricare, ubi vix dignoscitur, nisi ab eo ipso, qui id agit, qui digiti pruriant et qui auxilientur prurientibus.

St. Augustin: De Magistro.

L'histoire de la pensée linguistique n'est pas encore faite. Je ne dis pas: l'histoire de la linguistique, car celle-ci est à peu près connue; ce que j'ai en vue, c'est l'histoire de ces pensées isolées, restées sans conséquence, qui éclatèrent à travers des siècles, de vrais éclairs, laissant l'obscurité générale plus profonde encore. Donc, je pense à l'histoire des idées qui n'avaient pas eu d'histoire; preuve de la difficulté de diriger et de concentrer l'attention et réflexion sur le langage, l'instrument même de nos pensées.

St. Augustin en est un exemple brillant et vénérable. Sa pensée pénétrante et lumineuse envisageait bien la grande voie de la psychologie linguistique, mais personne ne le suivait. Or, que les linguistes veuillent n'excuser, je voudrais sur les pages suivantes attirer leur attention sur cet éclair puissant, fugitif et solitaire, oublié ou négligé, mais qui, heureusement fixé, il y a 1500 ans, peut encore aujourd'hui nous verser sa lumière.

I. Tout d'abord il faut répondre à une question préliminaire, pourquoi St. Augustin s'intéressait tant au langage humain. Il en parle bien souvent en beaucoup d'endroits de ses livres, parfois comme en passant ou par hasard, parfois il s'y arrête pour approfondir la question. Les problèmes naissent et renaissent tou-

jours dans sa tête, interrompent le cours de sa pensée, et lui-même, impuissant à résister aux séductions d'une idée lumineuse, il se laisse prendre par le courant. Telle est sa mentalité, il possède l'art de rapprocher des problèmes qui sont, semble-t-il, bien éloignés.

Il est impossible et inutile d'indiquer ici tous les passages qui se rapportent au langage. Ici je ne voudrais que relever un traité très subtil, consacré tout entier au langage, celui de »De Magistro«.

Rien d'étonnant à voir St. Augustin s'occuper tant de pareilles questions. Il faut prendre en considération sa vocation. Rhéteur, plus tard prêtre, évêque, il exerçait le *ministerium verbi* par profession. Mais ceci ne nous explique que l'intérêt pratique qu'il portait au langage. Il y voit avant tout un instrument puissant pour agir, convaincre, convertir. C'est dans cette attitude que prennent racines les oeuvres telles que le »De doctrina christiana« et le »De catechizandis rudibus« etc.

Cela n'empêche pas Augustin à envisager le langage d'un point de vue tout à fait théorique. On l'admire pour sa facilité de concilier deux habitudes, semble-t-il, opposées: homme d'action, il reste à la fois pendant toute sa vie l'homme de science le plus acharné. Comme tel, il se pose partout des problèmes d'ordre métaphysique ou théologique qui inquiètent son âme affamée du vrai, il s'élève, pour ainsi dire, aux plus hautes abstractions. Cependant, il ne perd pas de vue le *concretum,* le vaste domaine des faits. Sensible au mouvement dans le monde extérieur, il concentre son attention sur sa vie intérieure. Il suffit de lire les Confessions pour s'en convaincre. De plus, cette introspection se retrouve toujours dans les autres ouvrages qui ne traitent pas de sa propre personne. Sa vie intérieure devait être fort intensive, au-dessus de la moyenne. Cet état extraordinaire frappait son oeil spirituel et créait en lui l'habitude de s'analyser partout et toujours. Il serait très intéressant de recueillir les observations d'Augustin et d'en composer une psychologie descriptive générale et spéciale. J'insiste tant sur cette autoanalyse d'Augustin, car j'y vois la source principale de l'intérêt qu'il portait au langage de l'homme. La langue n'est elle pas en quelque sorte le miroir de l'âme; ne s'y reflète-t-il pas nos pensées, nos volontés et même

les vibrations des sentiments, bien entendu, d'une manière plus ou moins fidèle?

Tous les mouvements volontaires du corps, d'après Augustin, l'attitude tranquille, céder ou résister aux sentiments, tout cela exprime notre vie intérieure. Pareillement les signes que nous échangeons mutuellement, bien souvent même le silence que l'on garde exprès, nous donnent l'idée de la fluctuation continuelle dans notre âme [1].

Augustin a le sentiment profond de l'inconstance des choses; il la ressentait aussi en lui-même pendant qu'il ébauchait ses pensées en paroles vivantes. Prédicateur, catéchiste, il parlait avec vie. On prouve qu'il ne préparait pas d'ordinaire ses sermons pour le peuple. Cela se rapporte avant tout aux homélies sur l'Evangile de St. Jean. Nous y avons un document précieux de la prose courante au V[e] siècle. C'était des improvisations écrites par les *notarii* [2]. Rien d'étonnant que St. Augustin soit si sensible au mouvement intérieur du langage et même en distingue les nuances très subtiles.

Il y a une grande différence — voici à peu près ses paroles — dans l'état d'âme entre celui qui dicte quelque chose et celui qui est en face de son auditeur. Il est bien différent de corriger quelqu'un entre quatre yeux et devant des auditeurs d'une opinion tout à fait opposée. Qu'on s'imagine l'état d'âme de celui qui doit instruire une seule personne, en présence d'autres qui se donnent le rôle de juges ou de témoins bien renseignés sur la question! D'autre part l'orateur sera dans dispositions toutes différentes, s'il sait que le public attend avec impatience ce qu'il va dire. Les sentiments et les pensées changent à tout moment, selon que l'on parle dans un cercle d'amis, ou bien du haut d'une chaire élevée, lorsque le peuple fixe en silence l'orateur. Tout dépend de l'auditoire: s'il est nombreux ou bien assez réduit; s'il se compose d'intellectuels ou de paysans. Les auditeurs agissent et réagissent les uns sur les autres, à plus forte raison, ils exercent une grande influence sur l'orateur [3]. Voilà les observations d'Augustin faites, sans doute, sur sa propre personne, car il ajoute: »De me ipso tibi testis sum, aliter atque aliter me moveri, cum ante me catechisandum video eruditum, inertem, civem peregrinum, divitem, pauperem, privatum, honoratum, in potestate aliqua constitutum, illius aut illius gentis hominem, illius aut illius aetatis

aut sexus, ex illa aut illa secta, ex illo aut illo vulgari errore venientem, ac pro diversitate motus animi sermo ipse et procedit et progreditur et finitur« [4].

La parole a toujours sa physionomie à part. Elle dépend de l'état d'âme de l'orateur et de différentes circonstances. Considérons p. ex. un homme irrité. »Je ne sais pas — dit Augustin — pourquoi la parole devient si ardente dès qu'une vive douleur l'attise. On ne se décourage point, l'orateur parle avec plus de feu« [5].

Le contraire arrive, lorsque nous sommes tristes. »Parfois à cause de quelque scandale le chagrin serre la poitrine, même si l'on nous dit: Allez instruire cette personne, elle veut se convertir. On nous le dit sans soupçonner ce qui se passe dans notre coeur. Nous couvrons notre chagrin en entreprenant le travail. Et en effet, notre parole sera faible et sans attrait« [6].

La physionomie de la parole change dès que l'on veut convaincre quelqu'un d'une chose sans y réussir pourtant. Les causes en sont très souvent l'opiniâtreté et l'esprit de négation. Nous avons beau alors fournir les arguments les plus forts. L'interlocuteur n'en comprend pas la valeur, il ne voit pas les choses qui sont claires. C'est alors qu'on est obligé de parler tout au long de vérités toutes simples, pour les faire voir et toucher.

On pourrait multiplier les exemples pour prouver les changements psychiques continuels pendant que nous parlons, travail qui intéresserait immédiatement plutôt le psychologue [7].

II. Le langage est l'expression de la physionomie de l'âme, en quelque sorte un miroir de l'âme. Cependant on entend tant de plaintes de la part des poëtes et des non-poëtes sur l'insuffisance de la parole. Entendons Augustin: »Je ne goûte presque jamais dans mon sermon. Je veux en prononcer un meilleur, celui que j'entends au fond de mon âme avant de le développer au moyen de la parole. Si je n'y réussis pas, la tristesse m'accable parce que la langue n'égale pas mon coeur. Je voudrais tant que l'auditeur éprouve tout ce que j'éprouve et neanmoins je ne parle pas ainsi«.

D'où vient ce désaccord entre la parole et la pensée? St. Augustin nous en donne une explication.

On éprouve très souvent des illuminations subites qui tra-

versent l'âme comme des éclairs: »Intellectus quasi rapida coruscatione perfundit animum«. Nos efforts ne réussiront pas à prendre au vif ces lumières et ces chaleurs pour les emprisonner dans les paroles. A peine voulons-nous y toucher qu'elles se cachent, on ne sait pas où. Le langage est alors trop lent et trop lourd pour suivre la pensée, trop matériel pour lui ressembler. Quoiqu'il en soit, ces lumières ne disparaissent pas sans laisser quelques traces: »Ille intellectus vestigia quaedam miro modo impressit«. En quoi consistent elles, quelle est leur forme, voilà une question qui se pose. D'après Augustin, on ne peut pas dire qu'elles soient latines, ou grecques ou hébraïques. Une comparaison nous donnera l'idée de leur nature. Elles constituent la physionomie de l'âme, comme les traits physiques constituent celle du visage. Prenons p. ex. la colère. Les Latins l'appellent d'une façon, les Grecs d'une autre et pourtant la physionomie de l'homme irrité ne sera ni latine, ni grecque. Tout le monde n'entend pas ce que veut dire: »je me suis fâché«, sauf ceux qui comprennent cette langue. Mais dès que la passion s'extériorise sur le visage, personne n'en doute que cet homme soit irrité.

Il est impossible de dévoiler les traces de la pensée, afin de les mettre, pour ainsi dire, dans la conscience d'autrui. Cela peut se faire en quelque sorte avec la physionomie du visage, car elle est visible, tandis que les traces de la pensée demeurent imprimées à l'intérieur, dans la mémoire.

Cependant il nous est donné un moyen médiat de montrer notre physionomie psychique. Les traces de la pensée forment le fond qui nous fait produire les signes auditifs et ceux-ci précisément constituent la langue latine, grecque, hébraïque, peu importe, si on les prononce à haute voix ou bien intérieurement dans la mémoire. Nous pouvons en conclure que la langue ne peut pas être une copie fidèle de notre pensée. Au contraire, la disproportion entre la langue et les éclairs des pensées doit être énorme, si l'on considère que les signes ne ressemblent pas même aux traces de la pensée.

On distingue donc trois étapes dans le langage: l'acte de penser, la trace de cet acte, le symbole. La trace de la pensée n'est pas encore la pensée elle-même, mais sa copie plus on moins fidèle, une empreinte de la pensée. Le symbole linguistique n'est pas une image de la trace, mais en est un signe. A plus forte

raison, il ne peut pas égaler son type fondamental — la pensée. Pourtant nous voudrions parler comme nous entendons au moment de l'inspiration, tandis que la pensée est inexprimable. Si nous n'y réussissons pas, nous nous décourageons et par cela notre parole perd le reste de sa vigueur. Le prédicateur qui ne se rend pas compte de ce mécanisme, s'attriste en vain dès qu'il s'arrête sur les sons lourds et lents, et sur les enchaînements longs et compliqués des propositions, car il veut à tout prix exprimer ce que la pensée conçoit [8].

III. Homme de science, St. Augustin dut se demander dans quelle catégorie des phénomènes placer le langage. Or il le plaça dans le domaine des signes. Je veux m'arrêter sur cette notion, car c'est précisémment de nos jours qu'on définit ainsi la langue [9]. Les idées qui s'y rattachent sont exposées dans le »De doctrina christiana« (Lib. I, cap. 2; II, cap. 2, 3) [10].

»Omnis doctrina — dit Augustin — vel rerum est vel signorum, sed res per signa discuntur«. Tout ce qui nous entoure constitue l'ensemble des choses, à condition que celles-ci ne remplacent pas d'autres objets, pour les faire entrer dans notre esprit. Les arbres, les pierres, les bêtes — voilà quelques exemples pour les choses. »Proprie autem nunc res appellavi quae non ad significandum aliquid adhibentur«. Cependant on peut les employer aussi comme signes. Tels furent — dit Augustin — les morceaux de bois jetés dans l'eau amère (Ex. XV, 25), la pierre qui servait d'oreiller à Jacob (Gen. XXVIII, 11), l'animal immolé par Abraham. (Gen. XXII, 13). Voilà des choses qui remplissaient accidentellement le rôle de signes.

Le signe par excellence a sa raison d'être dans sa fonction de signifier. Tels sont les *mots-verba*, comme le dit Augustin, car leur unique rôle est de signifier quelque chose: »Sunt autem alia signa, quorum omnis usus in significando est, sicuti sunt verba. Ex quo intelligitur, quid appellem signa, res eas videlicet, quae ad significandum aliquid adhibentur«. Le signe est donc aussi une *chose-res*, car autrement il n'existerait pas du tout. Tout signe est *une chose*, la réciproque n'est pas vraie. *La chose* est ici prise dans le sens absolu, en tant que l'objet immédiat de notre connaissance. Le naturaliste qui étudie la plante, est mis en face de la *chose-res*, l'objet de ses observations.

A l'égard du signe on peut prendre deux attitudes: tantôt on le considère comme *res*, abstraction faite de sa valeur significative, tantôt l'on considère sa fonction de signifier: »Teneamus id nunc, in rebus considerandum esse quod sunt, non quod aliud etiam praeter seipsas significant. De rebus cum scriberem, praemisi commonens, ne quis in eis attenderet nisi quod sunt, non etiam, si quid aliud praeter se significant. Vicissim de signis disserens hoc dico, ne quis in eis attendat, quod sunt, sed potius quod signa sunt, id est quod significant«.

Le signe est donc opposé à la *res* dans le sens absolu. Je dis, dans le sens absolu, car le signe implique la *res* dans le sens relatif. Ne distinguons nous pas dans sa notion le *signans* et le *signatum*, ou, pour s'exprimer avec plus de précision, le signe en tant que *res* et son rapport à une autre chose? Si Augustin dit: »Omnis doctrina vel rerum est, vel signorum, sed res per signa discuntur«, il entend par *rerum est* les choses en elles-mêmes, c. à d. dans le sens absolu, en tant qu'elles sont l'objet immédiat de la connaissance; par *res per signa discuntur*, les choses par rapport au *signans*, c. à d. dans le sens relatif, en tant qu'elles sont l'objet médiat de la connaissance.

Le nom de signe convient au *signans*; Augustin le définit comme »res praeter speciem, quam ingerit sensibus, aliud aliquid ex se faciens in cogitationem venire«. Le signe suggère donc quelque pensée. Cependant tout ce qui suggère quelque pensée n'est pas toujours signe; nos associations s'opèrent de différentes manières. Le signe nous sert de guide qui nous conduit non pas dans la direction quelconque, mais nous dirige vers un but bien déterminé. Il attire d'abord notre attention sur lui-même, mais »praeter speciem quam ingerit sensibus«, il pousse la pensée plus loin. Prenons quelques exemples, cités par Augustin. Les traces nous font reconnaître souvent l'animal qui a passé sur la route, la fumée nous fait penser au feu. Les voix, les cris, les pleurs révèlent les l'états d'âme, les sentiments qui leur correspondent. Les signes militaires transmettent aux soldats la volonté du chef d'avancer ou bien de reculer devant l'ennemi.

Nous venons de voir que le signe est une *chose*. Les exemples cités nous permettent de déterminer encore plus exactement ce terme. La fonction du signe peut convenir non seulement aux

choses, c. à d. aux substances, mais aussi aux autres catégories: p. ex. aux qualités, aux actions-mouvements.

Ensuite, nous voyons dans quelques exemples un étroit rapport entre le *signans* et le *signatum*: vestigium — animal, fumus — ignis. La fonction de signifier est ici indépendante de l'homme; il ne la crée pas, il la constate. St. Augustin appelle ce genre des signes: *signa naturalia*. Il les nomme ainsi, parce que les choses qui sont à la fois des signes nous suggèrent des pensées sans leur volonté, malgré elles: la fumée indique ainsi le feu; elle ne le fait pas exprès; notre expérience bien des fois répétée dit qu'il y a du feu quelque part, dès que nous voyons la fumée. Les traces des animaux appartiennent aussi à cette catégorie. Les modifications du visage de l'homme triste nous font connaître son état d'âme malgré lui. Les mouvements de notre âme se reflètent sur le visage, bien que nous voulions les cacher.

Les signaux militaires sont d'un caractère tout à fait différent, car les soldats les donnent exprès. St. Augustin appelle les signes de ce genre *signa data* par opposition aux *signa naturalia*. Les êtres vivants échangent ces signes pour se transmettre mutuellement les sentiments, les volontés, les pensées. La principale raison de ces signes est le besoin social d'entrer en communication avec nos semblables. C'est dans cette catégorie que St. Augustin range aussi le langage des animaux: »Les animaux se donnent mutuellement des signes qui révèlent les tendances de leurs âmes. Si le coq trouve un grain, il appelle les poules. Le pigeon attire par le roucoulement la femelle et celle-ci l'appelle à son tour«.

Je voudrais souligner que les *signa data* ne se confondent pas du tout avec les *signa conventionalia*. Il ne faut pas oublier la différence spécifique qu'il y a entre les *signa naturalia* et les *signa data*: c'est la présence de la volonté de signifier qui est caractéristique pour ces derniers. Les *signa data* peuvent être conventionnels comme par ex. les signes de trompette, mais en est-il de même du roucoulement des pigeons?

Je ne puis pas m'abstenir de citer ici une observation d'Augustin très subtile. Nous avons vu que la physionomie reflète au moins en partie l'état d'âme de l'homme. Les cris et les pleurs nous font deviner les sentiments qui les provoquent. Au-

gustin place tous ces signes parmi les *signa naturalia*, parce qu'il n'y voit aucune volonté de communiquer quelque chose.

Or, quant au langage des animaux, il se demande, s'il ne faut pas le mettre au même rang: »Il y a une autre question, si ces signes (ceux des animaux), ainsi que les cris poussés sous l'impression d'une vive douleur, les traits changeants du visage ne font que suivre les mouvements de l'âme, ou bien s'ils constituent des signes dans le sens strict«. Augustin ne donne pas la solution de ce problème; en tout cas il entrevoit ce qu'il y a très souvent de complexe dans le langage où l'on retrouve à la fois la fonction d'exprimer et celle de signifier. La première dévoile l'homme comme individu, la seconde le montre comme être social, mais elle est aussi à la fois l'expression de son individualité. Quant au langage des animaux, il n'est pas facile de distinguer et de déterminer ces deux fonctions.

A la catégorie des *signa data* appartient avant tout la langue de l'homme dans le sens le plus large, c. à d. les gestes, les mouvements, la voix, en général l'appareil total des moyens d'expression. Il va de soi qu'on ne peut pas mettre tous ces signes dans le même rang. Les uns sont des phénomènes de la vue, la plupart se rapportent à l'ouïe et ce n'est qu'une minorité qui se rattache aux autres sens. L'homme qui fait des gestes parle, pour ainsi dire, aux yeux de son prochain. Il y en a beaucoup qui s'entendent très bien par les mouvements des membres et du corps tout entier. Les étandards et les autres signes militaires expriment la volonté du chef. Tous ces signes constituent le langage visuel.

Cependant en grande majorité les signes appartiennent à l'ouïe: avant tout le langage articulé qui joue le rôle principal dans les rapports mutuels des hommes. Tout ce qu'on exprime ou qu'on peut exprimer par les autres signes, p. ex. par la musique, peut être exprimé aussi par la parole. Il n'en est pas ainsi de la réciproque.

IV. Précisons maintenant plus exactement le rôle du langage dans la vie sociale. D'après St. Augustin, en parlant nous voulons, semble-t-il, instruire quelqu'un ou bien nous mêmes: *docere* et *discere* seraient donc les fonctions principales du langage. Cependant le *discere* peut se reduire au *docere*, car même

si nous interrogeons quelqu'un, nous communiquons à cette personne notre volonté de savoir.

Il y a ici une difficulté. Dans le chant on prononce d'ordinaire des paroles, alors c'est un langage. S'il en est ainsi, il faut se demander où est sa fonction de *docere*, quand on chante seul, sans témoins.

En principe la parole suppose au moins deux personnes. Dans bien des cas elle se borne à celui qui parle: alors s'opère sa fonction de *commemorare* qui a lieu aussi entre deux personnes, quand on répète des choses bien connues. Or St. Augustin voit dans le chant articulé, sans témoins, cette manifestation secondaire du langage — le *commemorare.* Si le chant n'est que modulé, sans paroles, on ne pourrait pas le prendre pour le langage dans le sens strict. Tel est le chant des oiseaux, le son des instruments. Il y a donc deux fonctions du langage: le *docere* et le *commemorare.*

Augustin se demande aussi, si ces deux fonctions se réalisent dans la prière. Elle est un entretien entre l'homme et Dieu, alors une sorte de langage. Quel est son but? Voulons nous par la prière communiquer à Dieu quelque chose de nouveau, ou bien lui rappeler nos besoins? Cela ne s'accorde pas avec notre conception de la divinité. Sans doute, la prière est une espèce de langage, mais ni le *docere,* ni le *commemorare*, semble-t-il, ne peuvent constituer sa fonction principale.

Augustin donne la solution suivante de cette difficulté. La prière ne consiste pas à prononcer les paroles; si l'on prononce les paroles usuelles de la prière, ce n'est pas pour instruire Dieu ou lui rappeler quelque chose; elles nous rappellent avec qui nous nous entretenons et ce que nous devons demander. Même si nous ne prononçons aucune parole, le *commemorare* s'opère dans notre pensée. C'est le langage intérieur: la mémoire fait sortir les mots cachés dans l'âme et ceux-ci se rattachent aux choses qu'ils signifient. Ainsi s'effectue dans la prière la fonction de *commemorare* [1].

Le rôle fondamental du langage est celui de *docere*, c. à d. de communiquer quelque chose à quelqu'un. On peut entendre ce terme dans un sens plus strict. Envisageons le langage du côté de l'auditeur. La question se pose, si le langage donne à l'auditeur de connaissances nouvelles. L'homme acquiert la science (connaissance) sous l'action de la réalité qui l'entoure. Cette con-

naissance, il l'absorbe, pour ainsi dire, car il vit toujours avec la nature et avec les hommes.

Or St. Augustin avance une affirmation de prime abord étrange, à savoir que les signes du langage ne nous fournissent presque aucune connaissance nouvelle. Qu'apprendra celui qui ne saisit pas la signification d'un signe en l'entendant ou en le voyant? D'autre part, qui sait déjà la valeur symbolique du signe n'apprendra pareillement presque rien de nouveau. La chose signifiée, il est vrai, va se présenter tout de suite à sa pensée, mais pour que cette représentation s'opère en lui, il a dû auparavant prendre connaissance de la chose elle-même.

Supposons que j'entende pour la première fois le mot *caput*. J'ignore si ce mot est un simple son, ou bien s'il signifie quelque chose. Je m'informe. On me montre du doigt la tête. Maintenant je sais déjà que le *caput* est un signe. Il y a, dans ce son, deux moments: l'un est acoustique, l'autre sémantique. Le premier, nous l'apercevons par l'ouïe, l'autre se fait connaître par la vision de la chose elle-même. Le doigt nous a montré non pas le signe, mais le membre principal du corps — la tête. Cependant, il ne me dit pas ce qu'est la tête, puisque je la connais depuis longtemps. Il faut donc d'abord connaître la chose pour comprendre ensuite la valeur symbolique des mots.

Un autre cas. Je suis pour la première fois en face d'un objet nouveau, d'un arbre par exemple. Quelqu'un me dit: *Voici une palme*. J'acquiers une nouvelle connaissance non pas au moyen du mot que j'entends, mais par la vision immédiate de cet arbre. Par la même vision j'apprends la valeur symbolique du mot *palme*. Je me fie non pas aux mots, mais à mes yeux.

Les mots et les paroles nous font chercher les choses. Si nous ne les trouvons pas, le langage n'aboutit qu'à une impression purement acoustique. Si nous les connaissons déjà, les mots ne nous donnent pas de science nouvelle. Le langage remplit alors la fonction de *commemorare* [12].

Ne semble-t-il pas que ces affirmations soient trop exagérées? Prenons en considération les faits historiques. Pour la plupart nous en avons la connaissance au moyen de la parole écrite. La Bible nous raconte p. ex. l'histoire de trois jeunes gens qui ayant bravé le roi et le feu, obtinrent ensuite par leur foi

les plus hautes dignités. N'est-ce pas pour nous une connaissance nouvelle?

St. Augustin y répond à peu près dans ce sens. Nous savions à peu près tout cela avant la lecture de la Bible ou avant le récit des autres. Nous savons par expérience ce que veulent dire le jeune homme, le feu, peut-être le roi etc. Néanmoins Annanias, Asarias et Misaël nous seront toujours inconnus. Les noms ne nous donnent pas la connaissance des personnes, pas plus que les mots ne nous font connaître les choses qu'ils signifient. Les événements historiques racontés dans la Bible seront toujours l'objet de la foi, puisque nous n'en avons pas la vision.

De même toute histoire se base sur les documents écrits; elle n'est donc pas une science dans le sens strict (connaissance par expérience), puisqu'elle ne nous donne jamais la vision des choses [13].

Celle-ci, il est vrai, s'effectue dans notre âme, pendant que nous entendons les paroles d'autrui, mais ce ne sont pas les paroles qui nous la donnent. La vision se réalise d'une triple manière. Si nous sommes en face des choses dont il s'agit et que nous les regardions et les touchions, nous en avons la perception mmédiate et nous en acquérons la connaissance. Ce sont les choses qui nous instruisent et non pas les sons.

On parle souvent des choses qui ne nous sont pas présentes, mais dont nous avons connaissance depuis longtemps. Les voilà bientôt arrivées dans le cours de la conversation sous la forme d'images gravées dans notre mémoire. Nous les portons toujours en nous pour les consulter au moment donné. C'est à elles que nous prêtons foi et non pas à la parole des autres.

Dans les raisonnements abstraits l'élève ne puise pas du dehors de nouvelles connaissances. Pour comprendre le maître il consulte les notions et les concepts qui se trouvent dans son âme [14].

Si le langage n'introduit pas dans l'âme la vision des choses et que celle-ci soit la *conditio sine qua non* de comprendre quelqu'un, n'est-il pas permis à l'auditeur de pénétrer au moins en partie dans le for intérieur de celui qui parle?

Or les paroles ne dévoilent pas toujours le fond des pensées et des sentiments de notre interlocuteur.

Qu'on imagine p. ex. un disciple d'Epicure développant en

chrétien les arguments en faveur de l'immortalité de l'âme. L'auditeur chrétien en sera convaincu, quoique les arguments du conférencier ne soient pas conformes à ses convictions. Pourtant celui-ci ne se proposa pas de tromper les auditeurs; il expose la doctrine d'une école sans découvrir ses sentiments.

Par contre le menteur trompe exprès son interlocuteur. Il pense aux choses dont il parle, nous le savons, bien que nous ne sachions pas s'il dit la vérité.

Troisième cas: nous parlons bien souvent des choses sans y penser, comme il arrive p. ex. pendant la prière répétée automatiquement.

Ensuite il y a aussi beaucoup de malentendus dans les rapports mutuels des gens à cause de la valeur sémantique des mots. Elle change à tout moment. Si par hasard l'un n'entend pas un mot de la même manière, il est impossible de se communiquer les pensées et les sentiments. Figurons nous deux amis; l'un avance cette affirmation: *Homo ab aliquibus belluis virtute superatur.* Il a surement raison, car beaucoup d'animaux surpassent l'homme par leurs forces physiques. L'autre est indigné d'entendre une proposition pareille, car il entend le mot *virtus* dans le sens moral et n'admet la moralité que chez les hommes. Aucun des deux ne ment, l'une et l'autre proposition est vraie, la mémoire ne les trompe pas, pourtant il y a un malentendu.

Ajoutons y les cas bien fréquents où l'on ne saisit pas bien les paroles d'autrui et nous aurons quelques obstacles qui ne permettent pas d'entrer dans l'âme du prochain [15].

V. Considérons le langage du point de vue du parlant. Comment l'homme parle-t-il, voilà une question qui se pose.

En analysant le langage tel qu'il est, Augustin y constate quelque chose d'a r b i t r a i r e. Il en est de même quant à l'écriture. La lettre *X* p. ex. a une autre signification pour le Latin et une autre pour le Grec. Celui qui comprend les deux langues, entend cette lettre autrement à mesure qu'il écrit à un Grec ou à un Latin. Le mot *beta* est employé pareillement par tous les deux, mais tandis que l'un appelle ainsi la deuxième lettre de l'alphabet, l'autre pense à une plante. Dit on *lege*, le Grec parlera, la Latin lira. Le même mot produit donc des réactions tout

à fait différentes, à mesure que le milieu change. (Cfr. De doctrina christiana, Lib. II, cap. 24, Migne t. 34 p. 54).

Quelle en est la raison? D'après Augustin, la valeur significative des mots ne leur est pas immanente, indépendante de notre volonté. S'il en était autrement, il n'y aurait pas tant de différences entre les langues. Tout dépend de la convention: »Hae omnes significationes pro suae cujusque societatis consensione animos movent et, quia diversa consensio est, diverse movent, nec ideo consenserunt in eas homines, quia jam valebant ad significationen, sed ideo valent, quia consenserunt in eas«. Il s'ensuit donc que le langage est l'oeuvre de l'homme: »Namque omnia, quae ideo valent inter homines, quia placuit inter eos, ut valeant, instituta hominum sunt«. (Migne t. 34 p. 54).

Augustin compte au nombre de ces institutions non seulement la langue, mais aussi toutes les catégories des signes. Tels sont les habits, les moeurs sociales qui distinguent le sexe, les poids, les mesures, les monnaies, sans lesquels la vie sociale serait presque impossible.

En principe l'homme voudrait garder la ressemblance entre les signes et les choses signifiées: »Appetunt tamen omnes quamdam similitudinen in significando, ut ipsa signa, in quantum possunt, rebus, quae significantur, similia sint«. Ces rapports de ressemblance, nous les trouvons dans les images, dans les statues, qui représentent les choses elles-mêmes. Cependant en général les signes ne gardent pas la ressemblance primitive, à moins qu'on ne s'entende: »quia multis modis simile aliquid alicui potest esse, non constant talia signa inter homines, nisi consensus accedat«. C'est pourquoi Augustin dit: »Adumbrata enim quaedam et naturalibus utcumque similia hominum instituta sunt«. (Migne t. 34 p. 54).

La chose est toujours la même pour tous, tandis que son nom change à tout instant. Si les noms obligent dans une société, ce n'est qu'en vertu de l'autorité et de la tradition: »Non enim ut de rebus ad disciplinam pertinentibus, ita de nominibus possumus respondere interrogati, propterea quia res omnium mentibus communiter sunt insitae, nomina vero, ut cuique placuit, imposita, quorum vis auctoritate atque consuetudine maxime nititur; unde etiam esse linguarum diversitas potest, rerum autem in ipsa

veritate constitutarum profecto non potest«. (De Musica, Lib. III, cap. 2, Migne t. 32 p. 1116).

Le rôle de la grammaire est de veiller sur la tradition: *custodia historiae*. Si l'on demande pourquoi telle prononciation oblige plutôt qu'une autre, la réponse en sera toujours la même: les anciens avaient prononcé ainsi:

»Atqui scias velim totam illam scientiam, quae grammatica graece, latine autem litteratura nominatur, historiae custodiam profiteri, vel solam, ut subtilior docet ratio, vel maxime, ut etiam pinguia corda concedunt. Itaque, verbi gratia, cum dixero *cano*, vel in versu forte posueris ita ut vel tu pronuntians producas hujus verbi syllabam primam, vel in versu eo loco ponas, ubi esse productam oportebat, reprehendet grammaticus, custos ille videlicet historiae, nihil aliud asserens, cur hanc corripi oporteat, nisi quod hi, qui ante nos fuerunt et quorum libri exstant tractanturque a grammaticis, ea correpta, non producta usi fuerint. Quare hic quidquid valet, auctoritas valet«. (De Musica, Lib. II, cap. 1, Migne t. 32 p. 1099).

Augustin s'oppose donc à ceux qui voient dans le langage un *donum infusum* de Dieu. Les adhérents de cette opinion entendent dans ce sens même le passage de la Genèse où Adam impose des noms aux animaux. La pensée d'Augustin y est claire; à propos de l'imposition des noms aux poissons il s'exprime ainsi: »Num igitur ullo modo credibile est in eadem lingua nomina piscium non ab homine, sed divinitus instituta, quae Deo docente homo postea disceret?« (De Genesi ad litteram, Lib. IX, cap. 12, Migne t. 34 p. 400).

Si le langage est donc une oeuvre de l'homme, il faut se demander quels sont les facteurs qui ont contribué le plus à sa création. Augustin souligne l'instinct social de l'homme qui le pousse à se lier à ses semblables. Or, sans le langage les liens sociaux entre les hommes seraient bien faibles et imparfaits. L'intelligence de l'homme s'en rend compte; c'est alors qu'elle se fait de la voix un moyen d'expression et de communication en lui ajoutant la valeur de symbole: »Illud, quod in nobis est rationale, id est quod ratione utitur et rationabilia vel facit vel sequitur, quia naturali quodam vinculo in eorum societate adstringebatur, cum quibus illi erat ratio ipsa communis, nec homini homo firmissime sociari posset, nisi colloquerentur atque ita sibi

mentes suas cogitationesque quasi refunderent, videt esse imponenda rebus vocabula, id est significantes quosdam sonos, ut, quoniam sentire animos suos non poterant, ad eos sibi copulandos sensu quasi interprete uterentur«. (De ordine, Lib. II, cap. 12, Migne t. 32 p. 1011). L'élément rationel est donc, d'après Augustin, le facteur principal dans la création du langage, bien qu'il ne soit pas unique. Passons maintenant à l'acquisition du langage par l'individu. Il ne le crée pas; c'est un fait incontestable que chaque homme parle la langue de son entourage. »Nam credo videri tibi ea lingua quemque loqui, qua loquuntur homines inter quos natus educatusque sit«. (De quantitate animae — Migne t. 32 p. 1052).

Augustin pose maintenant la question suivante: »Constitue ergo quempiam ibi natum atque altum, ubi homines non loquerentur, sed nutibus membrorumque motu cogitationes suas sibimet expromendas signarent; non censes eum talia esse facturum neque locuturum, qui loquentem neminem audierit?«

Le cas n'est pas fictif: »Itane tu vidisti Mediolani adolescentem honestissimi corporis et elegantissimae urbanitatis, mutum tamen atque ita surdum, ut neque alios nisi motu corporis intelligeret, neque ipse aliter quae vellet significaret? Hic enim est notissimus. Nam ego novi rusticum quemdam loquentem de loquente uxore filios omnes maros atque feminas quatuor fere, aut eo amplius (non enim satis nunc commemini) mutos surdosque genuisse. Nam ex eo, quod loqui non poterant, muti; ex eo, quod nulla signa nisi oculis colligebant, etiam surdi intelligebantur«. (De quantitate animae).

Or Augustin fait maintenant une supposition: »Quaeso, cogites, si ex hoc genere mas et femina jungerentur, atque in aliquam quocumque casu delati solitudinem, ubi tamen vivere valerent, gignerent filium non surdum, quemadmodum esset cum parentibus iste locuturus?« Les parents sont sourd-muets; le fils est normal; la famille vit isolée du monde. Comment s'entendra le fils avec ses parents?

Evidemment il parlera le langage de ses parents: »Quemadmodum censes, nisi ut parentes ei debant, ita gestu signa redditurum?« (De quantitate animae).

Cependant l'enfant nouveau-né ne parle pas du tout, ne sait pas imiter même les gestes de ses parents; c'est un fait »quod

puer infans non loquitur, atque in crescendo assequitur«. Comment arrive-t-il à parler?

Les remarques d'Augustin qui regardent le langage de l'enfant se trouvent surtout dans les Confessions [16]. Formellement elles ne concernent que sa propre personne: »J'ai remarqué depuis comment j'avais appris à parler«. Evidemment sa mémoire ne put pas embrasser la première enfance. Augustin observait donc les enfants et puis il se faisait renseigner par sa mère et les nourrices pour vérifier les résultats de ses observations: »Je vous rends grâces, Seigneur du ciel et de la terre, de ces merveilles de mon emfance dont aucun souvenir ne me reste; mais vous en avez donné la connaissance à l'homme, parce qu'il peut observer les autres et apprendre par le témoignage des mères«.

En réalité Augustin s'appuya avant tout sur ses propres sens en observant les premiers efforts des enfants qui veulent s'exprimer et se mettre en contact avec les autres. Les témoignages des femmes ne faisaient qu'affermir ses conclusions: »Tels sont tous les enfants et, en les observant depuis, j'ai appris d'eux ces choses mieux que n'auraient pu me les apprendre ceux qui les premiers m'ont élevé«.

Les linguistes et les psychologues d'aujord'hui placent les débuts du langage des enfants entièrement dans le domaine du langage expressif [17]. Or St. Augustin va le même chemin, il faut le faire remarquer.

Toutes les manifestations vitales de l'enfant portent d'abord le caractère des réactions qui suivent les modifications de l'organisme: »Alors je ne savais autre chose que savourer le lait qui me nourrissait ou pleurer, quand j'éprouvais quelque douleur. Bientôt après je commençai à rire d'abord pendant le sommeil, puis dans la veille. Voilà du moins ce qui m'a été dit et je l'ai cru, car je vois qu'ainsi sont les autres enfants; mais aucune trace de souvenir ne m'en est restée«.

A mesure que l'enfant se développe (au point de vue psychique et physique), le besoin de s'exprimer s'accroît en lui et il devient de plus en plus capable d'extérioriser ses sentiments. Dès que sa vie psychique s'éveille, il commence aussi, tant bien que mal, à exprimer ses désirs: »Je devins peu à peu capable de distinguer le lieu où j'étais; puis j'essayai de manifester mes désirs à ceux qui les pouvaient satisfaire, mais en vain«.

Quelle est la raison de cette impuissance, pourquoi en vain? »Parce que mes désirs étaient au dedans de moi et eux se trouvaient au dehors et aucun de leurs sens ne pouvait pénétrer dans mon âme«. Nous ne pouvons ni avoir la vision des sentiments et des pensées des autres, ni les ressentir immédiatement. Ce n'est que le signe qui puisse introduire l'homme dans l'âme du prochain.

Les efforts de l'enfant pour s'entendre avec les autres constituent le premier degré dans l'évolution de son langage. Il y a dans son âme une volonté de s'extérioriser, mais ceux qui entourent l'enfant ne se rendent pas compte de ce pénible travail.

Sous le vif besoin de s'exprimer l'enfant répète ses efforts pour faire comprendre ses volontés: »La première enfance à peine écoulée, je cherchais déjà des signes qui pussent exprimer mes sentiments«.

Qui sont les plus actifs dans ce travail, l'enfant ou bien ceux qui l'entourent? Il y a une grande différence, d'après Augustin, entre l'acquisition du langage par l'enfant et l'instruction qu'il reçoit plus tard à l'école. C'est le maître qui dispense à l'école les connaissances à assimiler; il dispose par degrés la matière à apprendre pour rendre le travail plus facile et méthodique. Par contre, au débuts du langage l'enfant fait les premiers pas tout seul, sans une impulsion spéciale du dehors: »J'ai remarqué depuis comment j'avais appris à parler; ce ne fut ni par les leçons, ni d'après la méthode des personnes plus avancées en âge, comme il arriva peu après, lorsqu'on voulut m'apprendre à lire; ce fut par la seule intelligence que vous avez mise en moi, ô mon Dieu«.

St. Augustin fait ici ressortir avant tout les ressources personnelles de l'enfant qui instinctivement, poussé par le besoin intérieur, »cherche à donner les signes à ses volontés«. De quels moyens se sert-il? »Cum gemitibus et vocibus variis et variis membrorum motibus edere vellem sensa cordis mei, ut voluntati pareretur«. Voilà un autre degré dans l'évolution du langage: l'actualisation des ressources innées de l'enfant. Le besoin d'extérioriser les mouvements intérieurs trouve son expression dans l'attitude de l'enfant. Ce langage a le caractère affectif et volitif; l'enfant veut se faire obéir et être le centre de tous ces signes [18].

Hélas, les désirs surpassent les moyens d'expression dont l'enfant peut disposer. Le langage des mouvements, des gestes

est insuffisant: »Je criais et m'agitais, c'était des signes qui correspondaient à mes volontés, les seuls qui fussent à ma portée, mais peu compréhensibles, car je ne savais pas tout exprimer, ou bien me rendre compris par tous«. Le langage de l'enfant, ainsi que sa vie psychique, est encore vague, c'est pourquoi on ne le comprend pas souvent. L'enfant ressent son impuissance, car il ne trouve pas, malgré ses efforts, de signes convenables.

C'est ce qui explique à Augustin le mécontentement et la colère qui se présentent alors chez l'enfant: »Et lorsqu'on n'accomplissait pas mon désir, soit qu'il n'eût pas été compris, soit qu'il y eût un danger, je m'irritais contre les personnes qui, ne pouvant m'être soumises à cause de leur âge, refusaient de me servir aveuglément et je me vengeais par mes larmes«.

Il y a donc un écart entre la disposition intérieure de l'enfant et son expression. Mais le besoin de se communiquer va toujours croissant et peu à peu se développe tout particulièrement l'un de ces moyen d'expression, à savoir la voix [19].

Ici commence l'influence de l'élément social, l'action de ceux qui entourent l'enfant. Celui-ci en entendant la conversation des autres aperçoit des mots et des phrases qui se gravent dans son âme. Lorsque l'enfant n'arrive pas à s'exprimer au moyen des agitations du corps, des gestes, »prensabam memoria, cum ipsi appellabant rem aliquam«, dit Augustin [20], ce qui veut dire que les paroles de l'entourage laissent quelques traces dans la mémoire de l'enfant.

Il y a une autre leçon, aussi acceptable, *praesonabam memoria*, dans le sens: *je répétais les paroles dans mon âme avant de les prononcer à haute voix.* La voix sonnerait dans l'imagination de l'enfant, comme nous revient une mélodie déjà entendue. Cela arrive dans l'activité poétique, lorsque l'artiste entend distinctement la conversation des personnes qu'il fait parler dans le drame.

Rien d'étonnant, si Augustin avait compris ainsi le langage intérieur de l'enfant. L'enfant est très sensible aux sons [21], mais avant de les copier, il faut qu'ils se gravent profondément dans son âme pour y laisser des traces. Le souvenir vif et intense pourra alors les délivrer et mettre en mouvement les organes de la parole.

Augustin passe maintenant à un autre point. Pendant que l'enfant s'exerce à prononcer les sons articulés, il s'opère en lui l'intelligence du langage entendu. C'est un fait de haute importance qu'on néglige souvent, cependant l'enfant comprend le langage de son entourage avant de se l'assimiler.

C'est un moment décisif pour sa formation, quand il commence à comprendre la valeur symbolique de la voix. Ce procès s'effectue insensiblement, par degrés; l'enfant ne s'en rend pas compte. Or, selon St. Augustin, c'est le langage expressif qui permet à l'enfant d'entrer dans l'âme des autres: »Je commençais à retenir dans ma mémoire les mots par lesquels ceux qui m'entouraient désignaient les objets, car je voyais qu'en nommant un objet ils s'en approchaient; je compris que le mot qu'ils avaient prononcé était le nom de la chose qu'ils voulaient atteindre«. Mais c'est un cercle vitieux, dira-t-on peut-être, que d'apprendre la valeur symbolique de la voix au moyen d'un autre signe, car enfin en nous approchant d'un objet pour le montrer nous faisons un signe.

Il se pose donc la question, comment l'enfant comprend le langage expressif, c'est à dire celui des gestes, des mouvements du corps etc. St. Augustin aurait répondu assurément qu'il l'avait appris tout seul: »Ego ipse, mente quam dedisti mihi Deus meus«, ainsi qu'il avait inventé tout seul son langage à lui »gemitibus variis et vocibus variis et variis membrorum motibus«. Les liens entre les signes du langage expressif et les choses signifiées sont naturels, tandis que, par contre, entre les pensées et la voix articulée ils sont conventionels. C'est pourquoi St. Augustin appelle le langage expressif »une langue commune à toutes les nations, car les inflexions de la voix et l'expression du visage et des yeux indiquent toutes les affections de l'âme«. Par analogie de ses propres signes, dont on ne se rend pas compte, l'enfant commence à comprendre la langue des autres [22].

Il ne faut pas penser que cette intelligence ne s'applique qu'à certains mots isolées. Le contexte nous dit le contraire. L'expression du visage et des yeux, les inflexions de la voix font suggérer à l'enfant la signification des sons *in petendis, habendis, rejiciendis, fugiendisve rebus*. L'enfant comprend la langue des autres par rapport à une situation, il aperçoit les mots en tant que symboles de quelques attitudes élémentaires il apprend

l'*affectionem animi in concreto in »petendis, habendis, rejiciendis, fugiendisve rebus«.*

Rien d'étonnant, si la valeur du même mot est soumise au commencement à des hésitations, mais toujours dans le cadre de situations semblables.

La signification ne se détermine que par degrés, lorsque l'enfant entend le même mot souvent et dans des situations différentes: »Ainsi en entendant les mêmes paroles souvent reparaître dans différentes phrases et toujours à la même place, je retins peu à peu leur véritable signification.

L'enfant arrive donc insensiblement à comprendre la valeur objective des mots et leurs significations grammaticales [23].

Quant au côté phonétique Augustin en dit très peu. Il ne fait qu'une mention des efforts de l'enfant à exercer ses organes de la parole: »Measque jam voluntates edomito in eis signis ore per haec enuntiabam. Sic cum his, inter quos eram, voluntatum enuntiandarum signa communicavi«.

Voilà quelques observations d'Augustin tirées des Confessions. Nous avons vu que St. Augustin oppose les débuts du langage à l'instruction scolaire pour faire ressortir l'initiative de l'enfant. Il y revient encore une fois dans le XIVe chapitre des Confessions [24]. L'enseignement de la langue grecque lui rendait la vie fastidieuse: »La difficulté d'apprendre une langue étrangère mêlait ainsi son amertume à tous les charmes des récits fabuleux des Grecs; je n'entendais pas ce langage et l'on ne m'épargnait ni menaces ni châtiments pour m'obliger à l'apprendre«. Petit enfant, il s'appropria la langue d'une manière tout à fait contraire — sans menaces et châtiments: »Dans un âge plus tendre j'avais été aussi ignorant de la langue latine; mais je l'avais apprise sans ces appréhensions et ces violences, par une expérience de tous les moments, au milieu des caresses de mes nourrices et des joyeux amusements de mon âge«.

Il avait pour maître son coeur; ceux qui l'entouraient, lui fournissaient, pour ainsi dire, des modèles à extérioriser sa vie intérieure: »Je n'étais point pressé par aucune menace, mais seulement par mon propre coeur, avide de produire au dehors ce qu'il avait conçu au dedans de lui-même; ce qui ne se pouvait sans avoir appris d'abord quelques mots qui ne m'étaient point

positivement enseignés, mais que j'apprenais de ceux à qui j'étais moi-même empressé de me faire entendre«.

Je voudrais encore souligner le criticisme d'Augustin à l'égard de ses affirmations. Il prend en considération avant tout le côté intérieur du langage. Or il est si difficile de pénétrer dans l'âme des autres et l'on se trompe bien souvent en jugeant les choses qui ne sont pas soumises aux sens: »Ce premier âge dont j'ai perdu tout souvenir et que je ne connais que par le témoignage des hommes et l'exemple des autres enfants, bien que cette connaissance ne soit qu'une hypothèse bien hardie, ce premier âge, dois-je, en vérité, le compter comme une partie de la vie dont il m'est donné de jouir dans ce monde?«. »Multum fida conjectura«, voilà comment Augustin qualifie ses affirmations.

Voici quelques idées et observations d'Augustin sur le langage, tirées de ses oeuvres, qui révèlent son esprit à la fois vaste et pénétrant. Pour mettre plus de clarté dans cet exposé, j'en résumerai les points les plus importants.

I. Si St. Augustin, psychologue né, s'intéresse tant au langage, c'est que celui-ci lui permet d'entrer dans l'âme de l'homme. Il a le sentiment de l'écoulement continuel dans son âme, pendant qu'il ébauche ses pensées en paroles. Bien plus, il en distingue les nuances subtiles, la physionomie du langage, qui dépendent de différentes circonstances.

II. Reflet de la vie intérieure, le langage ne peut pas rendre l'âme toute entière, malgré tous les efforts. Les pensées sont momentanées et se cachent ensuite dans quelques abîmes mystérieux. Heureusement elles ne passent pas sans laisser de traces; et celles-ci constituent la physionomie psychique de l'âme sans être pourtant une copie de la pensée. Les paroles ne sont que des symboles de ces traces. S'il n'y a pas de ressemblance entre les symboles et les traces de la pensée, il n'y aura, à plus forte raison, qu'un désaccord profond entre les symboles et les pensées elles-mêmes.

III. Reflet de l'âme, le langage est aussi le moyen de communication. Augustin le place comme tel dans le vaste domaine des signes. *Res praeter speciem, quam ingerit sensibus, aliud aliquid ex se faciens in cogitationem venire*, voilà la définition du

signe. *Res*: le signe est une chose, car autrement il n'existerait pas du tout; *praeter speciem suam*: outre son entité physique, le signe possède une valeur externe; *aliud faciens in cogitationem venire*: il suggère quelques pensées, car il attire notre attention d'abord sur lui-même, pour la concentrer ensuite sur un objet déterminé.

Il faut donc distinguer dans le signe le *signans* et le *signatum*. L'esprit peut prendre deux attitudes à l'égard du signe: tantôt il fait abstraction de sa valeur significative en le considérant comme une *res*, objet immédiat de la connaissance, tantôt il fixe sa fonction de signifier.

Si la valeur de signifier ne dépend pas du *signans*, nous avons les *signa naturalia*; s'il y a dans la *signans* une volonté de signifier quelque chose, nous avons les *signa data*.

C'est dans cette dernière catégorie qu'Augustin place le langage, pris dans le sens le plus large (c. à d. l'ensemble des signes de communication). Les différents signes se rapportent à tous les sens, mais les signes auditifs, articulés l'emportent sur tous les autres, car ils sont les plus nombreux et peuvent exprimer tout ce que les autres signes expriment.

IV. Augustin précise encore davantage la fonction sociale du langage. Le rôle principal de la parole est celui de *docere*, ce qui ne veut pas dire que le langage donne à l'auditeur la vision des choses, il la suppose plutôt. Si tout ce qu'on dit est déjà connu par l'interlocuteur, il y a alors la fonction de *commemorare*.

En examinant les effets de la parole chez l'auditeur on peut dire:

1) qu'elle le pousse à chercher les choses;

2) qu'elle lui fournit des connaissances dont les éléments ont pour base la vision des choses, tandis que la réunion de ces éléments s'appuie sur la foi (récits historiques);

3) qu'elle fait revivre les connaissances déjà acquises;

4) qu'elle dévoile, au moins en partie, l'état intérieur du parlant.

Voilà le sens des fonctions du langage, celles de *docendi* et de *commemorandi*.

V. Le langage considéré chez le parlant accuse quelque chose d'arbitraire, ainsi que toutes les institutions sociales. La

valeur significative des mots est donc conventionelle; si les mots obligent, ce n'est qu'en vertu de l'autorité et de la tradition.

Il s'ensuit donc que le langage est une oeuvre de l'homme et non pas un *donum infusum* de Dieu. Deux facteurs avaient contribué à sa création: *l'instinct social* qui pousse l'homme à se lier à son prochain, *l'intelligence* qui réalise le besoin social de l'homme et fait de la voix son principal moyen d'expression et de communication en lui ajoutout la valeur de symbole.

L'individu ne crée pas le langage, il le reçoit de son entourage. Voici comment, d'après Augustin, l'enfant arrive à parler:

1) Dès que sa vie psychique s'éveille, il ressent de plus en plus le besoin de se mettre en communication avec les autres. Les premiers efforts sont vains.

2) Peu à peu il arrive à se constituer un langage à lui: c'est le langage expressif, l'expression du visage, des yeux, les mouvements du corps, les intonations de la voix. Ce langage a le caractère affectif et volitif; l'enfant veut à tout prix attirer l'attention sur lui-même, hélas, les moyens dont il dispose sont bien imparfaits; il ne réussit donc pas à tout exprimer et à se faire comprendre par tous.

3) Alors il commence à travailler sa voix pour y faire passer le courant de ses sentiments et de ses désirs. Le langage de l'entourage se grave dans sa mémoire, l'enfant tente d'articuler lui-même et d'imiter les autres.

4) En même temps il commence à comprendre la langue des autres. Il saisit d'abord la signification du langage expressif de cette langue internationale, *naturalia verba omnium populorum.* Au moyen de ce langage il arrive à comprendre quelques mots, non pas isolés, mais faisant partie de la situation et de la conduite des autres. La valeur significative se précise de plus en plus, dès que l'enfant entend les mêmes mots souvent et dans différentes phrases.

5) Après avoir automatisé les organes de la parole, l'enfant s'initie peu à peu à la conversation avec la langue de son entourage.

P. K. Gołębiewski C. Ss. R.

Notes.

[1] Etenim nunc movere membra corporis per voluntatem, nunc non movere; nunc aliquo afectu affici, nunc non affici; nunc proferre per signa sapientes sententias, nunc esse in silentio, propria sunt mutabilitatis animi et mentis. (Conf. L. VII, cap. 19).

[2] R. J. Deferrari: Saint Augustine's method of composing and delivering sermons. (I American Journal of Philology, 1922, 92—123); R. Deferrari: Verbatim reports of Augustine's unwritten sermons. (Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, 1915, 34—45).

[3] Volo cogites, aliam esse intentionem dictantis, cum lector futurus cogitatur, et aliam loquentis, cum praesens auditor attenditur; et in eo ipso aliam in secreto monentis, dum alius, qui de nobis judicet praesto est; aliam palam docentis aliquid, cum dissimiliter opinantium circumstat auditus; et in hoc genere aliam, cum docetur unus, ceteri autem tamquam judicantes aut attestantes, quae sibi nota sunt, audiunt; aliam, cum omnes communiter, quid ad eos proferamus, exspectant; et rursus in hoc ipso aliam, cum quasi privatim consedetur, ut sermocinatio conseratur; aliam, cum populus tacens unum de loco superiore dicturum suspensus intuetur; multum interest, et cum ita dicimus, utrum adsint pauci, an multi; docti an indocti, an ex utroque genere mixti; urbani an rustici an hi et illi simul, an populus ex omni genere temperatum sit. Fieri enim non potest, nisi aliter atque aliter afficiant locuturum atque dicturum, et ut sermo, qui profertur, affectionis animi, a quo profertur, quemdam quasi vultum gerat et pro eadem diversitate diverse afficiat auditores, cum et ipsi seipsos diverse afficiant invicem praesentia sua. (De catechizandis rudibus. Cap. XV. Migne t. 40, p. 328).

[4] Ibidem.

[5] Et nescio, quomodo in hujusmodi monitis ardentior sermo est, cum fomitem subministrat praesens dolor, ut non solum pigriores non simus, sed eo ipso discamus accensius atque vehementius. (De catech. rudibus. Cap. XIV. Migne t. 40, p. 327).

[6] Aliquando item ex aliquo scandalo moeror pectus obsedit et tunc nobis dicitur: veni, loquere huic, christianus vult fieri. Nescitur enim ab ignorantibus, quid nos clausum intus exurat; quibus, si affectum nostrum aperire non oportet, suscipimus ingratius, quod volunt. Et profecto languidus et insuavis ille sermo erit, per venam cordis aestuantem fumantemque trajectus. (De catech. rudibus. Cap. X. Migne t. 40, p. 321).

[7] Nunc vero, quoniam ille est major et tetrior insipientium morbus animorum, quo irrationabiles motus suos, etiam post rationem plene redditam, quanta homini ab homine debetur, sive obstinatisima pervicacia, qua et ea, quae cernuntur, non feruntur, tamquam ipsam rationem veritatemque defendunt, fit necessitas copiosius dicendi plerumque res claras, velut eas non spectantibus intuendas, sed quodam modo tangendas palpantibus et conniventibus offeramus. (De civitate Dei. L. I, cap. 1. Migne t. 41, p. 47).

[8] Nam et mihi prope semper sermo meus displicet. Melioris enim avidus sum, quo saepe fruor interius, antequam eum explicare verbis sonantibus coepero; quod ubi minus, quam mihi notus est, evaluero, contristor

linguam meam cordi meo non potuisse sufficere. Totum enim quod intelligo, volo, ut qui me audit, intelligat; et sentio me non ita loqui, ut hoc efficiam, maxime quia ille intellectus quasi rapida coruscatione perfundit animum; illa autem locutio tarda et longa est, longeque dissimilis, et dum ista volvitur, jam se ille in secreta sua condidit; tamen quia vestigia quaedam miro modo impressit memoriae, perdurant illa cum syllabarum morulis; atque ex eisdem vestigiis sonantia signa peragimus, quae lingua dicitur vel latina, vel graeca, vel hebraea, vel alia quaelibet, sive cogitentur haec signa, sive etiam voce proferantur; cum illa vestigia nec latina, nec graeca, vel hebraea, nec cujusque alterius gentis sint propria, sed ita efficiantur in animo, ut vultus in corpore. Aliter enim latine ira dicitur graece, aliter atque aliter aliarum diversitate linguarum, non autem latinus aut graecus est vultus irati. Non itaque omnes gentes intelligunt, cum quisque dicit iratus sum, sed Latini tantum; at si affectus excandescentis animi exeat in faciem, vultumque afficiat, omnes sentiunt, qui intuentur iratum. Sed neque ita licet educere et quasi exporrigere in sensum audientium per sonum vocis illa vestigia, quae imprimit intellectus memoriae, sicut apertus et manifestus est vultus; illa enim sunt intus in animo, iste foris in corpore.

Quapropter conjiciendum est, quantum distet sonus oris nostri ab illo ictu intelligentiae, quando ne ipsi quidem impressioni memoriae similis est.

Nos autem plerumque in auditoris utilitatem vehementer ardentes, ita loqui volumus, quemadmodum tunc intelligimus, cum per ipsam intentionem loqui non possumus; et quia non succendit, angimur, et veluti frustra operam insumamus, taedio marcescimus; atque ex ipso taedio languidior fit idem sermo et hebetior quam erat, unde perduxit ad taedium. (De catech. rudibus. Cap. II. Migne t. 40, p. 311, 312).

[9] Cfr. De Saussure, Cours de linguistique général, 1922.

[10] Omnis doctrina vel rerum est vel signorum, sed res per signa discuntur. Proprie autem nunc res appellavi, quae non ad significandum aliquid adhibentur, sicuti est lignum, lapis, pecus, atque hujusmodi caetera. Sed non illud lignum, quod in aquas amaras Moysen misisse legimus, ut amaritudine carerent (Ex. XV. 25); neque ille lapis, quem Jacob sibi ad caput posuerat (Gen. XXVIII, 11); neque illud pecus, quod pro filio immolavit Abraham (Gen. XXII, 13). Hae namque ita res sunt, ut aliarum etiam signa sint rerum.

Sunt autem alia signa, quorum omnis usus in significando est, sicuti sunt verba. Nemo enim utitur verbis, nisi aliquid significandi gratia. Ex quo intelligitur, quid appellem signa, res eas videlicet, quae ad significandum aliquid adhibentur. Quam ob rem omne signum etiam res aliqua est; quod enim nulla res est, omnino nihil est; non autem omnis res etiam signum est.

Et ideo in hac divisione rerum atque signorum, cum de rebus loquemur, ita loquemur, ut, etiamsi earum aliquae adhiberi ad significandum possint, non impediant partitionem, qua prius de rebus, postea de signis disseremus; memoriterque teneamus, id nunc in rebus considerandum esse, quod sunt, non quod aliud etiam praeter seipsas significant.

Quoniam de rebus cum scriberem, praemisi commonens, ne quis in eis

attenderet, nisi quod sunt, non etiam, si quid aliud praeter se significant; vicissim de signis disserens hoc dico, ne quis in eis attendat, quod sunt, sed potius, quod signa sunt, id est, quod significant. Signum est enim res, praeter speciem, quam ingerit sensibus, aliud aliquid ex se faciens in cogitationem venire, sicut vestigio viso transisse animal, cujus vestigium est, cogitamus; et fumo viso ignem subesse cognoscimus; et voce animantis audita affectionem animi ejus advertimus; et tuba sonante milites vel progredi se, vel regredi, et si quid aliud pugna postulat, oportere noverunt. Signorum igitur alia sunt naturalia, alia data. Naturalia sunt, quae sine voluntate atque ullo appetitu significandi praeter se aliquid aliud ex se cognosci faciunt, sicut est fumus significans ignem. Non enim volens significare id facit, sed rerum expertarum animadversione et notatione cognoscitur ignem subesse, etiam si fumus solus appareat. Sed et vestigium transeuntis animantis ad hoc genus pertinet et vultus irrati seu tristis affectionem animi significat, etiam nulla ejus voluntate, qui aut iratus aut tristis est, aut si quis alius motus animi vultu indice proditur, etiam nobis non id agentibus, ut prodatur. Sed de hoc toto genere nunc disserere non est propositum. Quoniam tamen incidit in partitionem nostram, praeteriri omnino non potuit; atque id hactenus notatum esse suffecerit.

Data vero signa sunt, quae sibi quaeque viventia invicem dant ad demonstrandos, quantum possunt, motus animi sui, vel sensa, aut intellecta quaelibet. Nec ulla causa nobis significandi, id est signi dandi, nisi ad depromendum et trajiciendum in alterius animum id, quod animo gerit is, qui signum dat. Horum igitur signorum genus, quantum ad hominem attinet, considerare atque tractare statuimus; quia et signa divinitus data, quae in Scripturis sanctis continentur, per homines nobis indicata sunt, qui ea conscripserunt. Habent etiam bestiae quaedam inter se signa, quibus produnt appetitum animi sui. Nam et gallus gallinaceus reperto cibo dat signum vocis gallinae, ut accurrat; et columbus gemitu columbam vocat, vel ab ea vicissim vocatur; et multa hujusmodi animadverti solent. Quae utrum, sicut vultus aut dolentis clamor sine significandi voluntate sequantur motum animi, an vere ad significandum dentur, alia questio est, et ad rem, quae agitur, non pertinet.

Signorum igitur, quibus inter se homines sua sensa communicant, quaedam pertinent ad oculorum sensum, pleraque ad aurium, paucissima ad caeteros sensus. Nam cum innuimus, non damus signum nisi oculis ejus, quem volumus per hoc signum voluntatis nostrae participem facere. Et quidam motu manuum pleraque significant; et histriones omnium membrorum motibus dant signa quaedam scientibus et cum oculis eorum quasi fabulantur; et vexilla draconesque militares per oculos insinuant voluntatem ducum; et sunt haec omnia quasi quaedam verba visibilia. Ad aures autem quae pertinent, ut dixi, plura sunt, in verbis maxime. Nam et tuba et tibia et cithara dant plerumque non solum suavem, sed etiam significantem sonum. Sed haec omnia signa verbis comparata paucissima sunt. Verba enim prorsus inter homines obtinuerunt principatum significandi quaecumque animo concipiuntur, si ea quisque prodere velit... innumerabilis multitudo signorum, quibus suas cogitationes homines exerunt, in verbis constituta est. Nam

illa signa omnia, quorum genera breviter attigi, potui verbis enuntiare; verba vero illis signis nullo modo possem.

Sed quia verberato aëre statim transeunt, nec diutius manent quam sonant, instituta sont per litteras signa verborum. Ita voces oculis ostenduntur, non per seipsas, sed per signa quaedam sua. (De doctrina christiana. L. I, cap. 2. II, cap. 1, 2, 3. 4. Migne t. 34, p. 19, 20, 33. etc.).

[11] Le problème du rôle du langage dans la vie est traité dans le »De Magistro«. C'est un dialogue entre Augustin et son fils Adeodatus.

Aug. Quid tibi videmur efficere velle, cum loquimur? Ad. Quantum quidem mihi nunc occurrit, aut docere, aut discere. Aug. Unum horum video et assentior: nam loquendo nos docere velle manifestum est; discere autem quomodo? Ad. Quo tandem censes nisi cum interrogamus? Aug. Etiam tunc nihil aliud quam docere nos velle intelligo. Nam quaero abs te, utrum ob aliam causam interroges, nisi ut eum, quem interrogas, doceas, quid velis? Ad. Verum dicis. Aug. Vides ergo jam nihil nos locutione, nisi ut doceamus appetere. Ad. Non plane video: nam si nihil est aliud loqui quam verba promere, video nos id facere, cum cantamus. Quod cum soli saepe facimus, nullo praesente qui discet, non puto nos docere aliquid velle. Aug. At ego puto esse quoddam genus docendi per commemorationem, magnum sane, quod in nostra hac sermocinatione res ipsa indicabit. Sed si tu non arbitraris nos discere, cum recordamur, nec docere illum qui commemorat, non resisto tibi: et duas jam loquendi causas constituo, aut ut doceamus, aut ut commemoremus vel alios vel nosmetipsos; quod etiam, dum cantamus, efficimus; au tibi non videtur? Ad. Non prorsus, nam raro admodum est, ut ego cantem commemorandi me gratia, sed tandummodo delectandi. Aug. Video, quid sentias. Sed nonne attendis id quod te delectat in cantu modulationem quamdam esse soni; quae, quoniam verbis et addi et detrahi potest, aliud est cantare? Nam et tibiis et cithara cantatur, et aves cantant, et nos interdum sine verbis musicum aliquid sonamus, qui sonus cantus dici potest, locutio non potest; an quidquam est, quod contradicas? Ad. Nihil sane.

Aug. Videtur ergo tibi nisi aut docendi, aut commemorandi causa non esse institutam locutionem? Ad. Videretur, nisi me moveret, quod dum oramus, utique loquimur; nec tamen Deum aut doceri aliquid a nobis, aut commemorari fas est credere. Aug. Nescire te arbitror non ob aliud nobis praeceptum esse, ut in clausis cubiculis oremus (Matth. VI, 6), quo nomine significantur mentis penetralia, nisi quod Deus, ut nobis, quod cupimus praestet, commemorari aut doceri nostra locutione non quaerit. Qui enim loquitur, suae voluntatis signum foras dat per articulatum sonum; Deus autem in ipsis rationalis animae secretis, qui homo interior vocatur, et quaerendus et depraecandus est; haec enim sua templa esse voluit. An apud Apostolum non legisti: »Nescitis quia templum Dei estis, et spiritus Dei habitat in vobis« (I Cor. III, 16)? et »In interiore homine habitare Christum« (Ephes. III, 16, 7)? Nec in propheta animadvertisti »Dicite in cordibus vestris, et in cubilibus vestris compungimini, sacrificate sacrificium justitiae et sperate in Domino«. (Ps. 5, 6)? Ubi putas sacrificium justitiae sacrificari, nisi in templo mentis, et in cubilibus cordis? Ubi autem sacrificandum est,

ibi et orandum. Quare non opus est locutione, cum oramus, id est sonantibus verbis, nisi forte, sicut sacerdotes faciunt, significandae mentis suae causa, non ut Deus, sed ud homines audiant, et consensione quadam per commemorationem suspendantur in Deum, an tu aliud existimas? Ad. Omnino assentior. Aug. Non te ergo movet, quod summus Magister cum orare doceret discipulos, verba quaedam docuerit (Matth. VI, 9)? in quo nihil aliud videtur fecisse, quam docuisse, quomodo in orando loqui oporteret? Ad. Nihil me omnino istud movet; non enim verba, sed res ipsas verbis eos docuit, quibus et seipsi commonefacerent, a quo et quid esse orandum, cum in penetralibus, ut dictum est, mentis orarent. Aug. Recte intelligis; simul enim te credo animadvertere, etiamsi quisquam contendat, quamvis nullum edamus sonum, tamen quia ipsa verba cogitamus, nos intus apud animum loqui, sic quoque locutione nihil aliud agere, quam commonere, cum memoria, cui verba inhaerent, ea revolvendo facit venire in mentem res ipsas, quarum signa sunt verba. Ad. Intelligo et sequor. (De Magistro. Cap. I. Migne t. 32, p. 1193).

[13] Jam enim ex his non unum aliquid aut alterum, sed millia rerum animo occurrunt, quae nullo signo dato per seipsa monstrentur. Quid enim dubitemus, oro te? Nam ut hominum omittam innumerabilia spectacula in omnibus theatris sine signo ipsis rebus exhibentium; solem certe istum lucemque haec omnia perfundentem atque vestientem, lunam et caetera sidera, terras et maria, quaeque in his innumerabiliter gignuntur, nonne per seipsa exhibet atque ostendit Deus et natura cernentibus?

Quodsi diligentius consideremus, fortasse nihil invenies, quod per sua signa discatur. Cum enim mihi signum datur, si nescientem me invenit, cujus rei signum sit, docere me nihil potest; si vero scientem, quid disco per signum? Non enim mihi rem, quam significat ostendit verbum, cum lego »Et saraballae eorum non sunt immutatae« (Dan. III, 94). Nam si quaedam capitum tegmina nuncupantur hoc nomine, num ego hoc audito, aut quid sit caput, aut quid sint tegmina didici? Ante ista noveram; neque cum appellarentur ab aliis, sed cum a me viderentur, eorum est mihi facta notitia. Etenim cum primum istae duae syllabae, cum dicimus caput aures meas impulerant, tam nescivi, quid significarent, quam cum primo audirem legeremve saraballas. Sed cum saepe diceretur caput, notans atque advertens, quando diceretur, reperi vocabulum esse rei, quae mihi jam erat videndo notissima. Quod priusquam reperissem, tantum mihi sonus erat hoc verbum; signum vero esse didici, quando cujus rei esse signum inveni; quam quidem, ut dixi, non significatu, sed aspectu didiceram. Itaque magis signum re cognita, quam signo dato ipsa res discitur. — Quod ut apertius intelligas, finge nos primum nunc audire quod dicitur caput; et nescientes, utrum vox ista sit tantummodo sonans, an aliquid etiam significans, quaerere, quid sit caput (memento nos non rei, quae significatur, sed ipsius signi velle habere notitiam, qua caruimus profecto, quamdiu, cujus signum est, ignoramus); si ergo ita quaerentibus res ipsa digito demonstretur, hac conspecta discimus signum, quod audieramus tantum, nondum noveramus. In quo tamen signo cum duo sint, sonus et significatio, sonum certe non per signum percipimus, sed eo ipso aure pulsata; significationem autem re, quae significatur, aspecta.

Nam illa intentio digiti significare nihil aliud potest, quam illud, in quod intenditur digitus; intentus est autem non in signum, sed in membrum, quod caput vocatur. Itaque per illam neque rem possum nosse, quam noveram, neque signum, in quod intentus digitus non est. Sed de intentione digiti non nimis curo, quia ipsius demonstrationis signum mihi videtur potius, quam rerum aliquarum, quae demonstrantur, sicut adverbium, quo ecce dicimus; nam et cum hoc adverbio digitum solemus intendere, ne unum demonstrandi signum non sit satis. Et id maxime tibi nitor persuadere, si potero, per ea signa, quae verba appellantur, nos nihil discere; potius enim, ut dixi, vim verbi, i. e. significationem, quae latet in sono, re ipsa, quae significatur cognita, discimus, quam illam tali significatione percipimus.

Et quod dixi de capite, hoc etiam de tegminibus, deque aliis rebus innumerabilibus dixerim; quas tamen cum jam noverim, saraballas illas adhuc usque non novi; quas mihi si gestu quispiam significarit aut pinxerit, aut aliquid, cui similes sunt, ostenderit, non dicam non me docuerit, quod facile obtinerem, si paulo amplius loqui vellem, sed dico id, quod proximum est, non verbis docuerit. Quod si eis forte conspectis, cum simul adero me admonuerit dicens »ecce saraballas«, discam rem, quam nesciebam, non per verba, quae dicta sunt, sed per ejus aspectum, per quem factum est, ut etiam nomen illud quid valeret, nossem ac tenerem. Non enim cum rem ipsam didici, verbis alienis credidi, sed oculis meis; illis tamen fortasse, ut attenderem, credidi, id est ut aspectu quaererem, quid viderem. (De Magistro. Cap. X. Migne t. 32, p. 1213).

[13] Quodsi dixeris tegmina illa capitum, quorum nomen sono tantum tenemus, non nos posse nisi visa cognoscere, neque nomen ipsum plenius nisi ipsis cognitis posse: quod tamen de pueris accepimus, ut regem ac flammas fide ac religione superaverint, quas laudes Deo cecinerint, quos honores ab ipso etiam inimico meruerint, num aliter nisi per verba didicimus? Respondebo cuncta, quae illis verbis significata sunt, in nostra notitia jam fuisse. Nam quid sint tres pueri, quid fornax, quid ignis, quid rex, quid denique illaesi ab igne, caeteraque omnia jam tenebam, quae verba illa significant. Ananias vero et Asarias et Misaël tam mihi ignoti sunt, quam illae saraballae; nec ad eos cognoscendos haec me nomina quidquam adjuverunt aut adjuvare jam potuerant. Haec autem omnia, quae in illa leguntur historia, ita illo tempore facta esse, ut scripta sunt, credere me potius, quam scire fateor, neque istam differentiam iidem ipsi, quibus credimus, nescierunt. Ait enim propheta: »Nisi credidatis, non intelligetis« (Isai. VII, 9); quod non dixisset profecto, si nihil distare judicasset. Quod ergo intelligo, id et credo, at non omne, quod credo, scio; cui utilitati hanc quoque adjungo de tribus pueris historiam; quare pleraque rerum, cum scire non possim, quanta tamen utilitate credantur, scio. (De Magistro. Cap. XI. Migne t. 32, p. 1215).

[14] Quodsi et de coloribus lucem, et de caeteris, quae per corpus sentimus, elementa hujus mundi eademque corpora, quae sentimus, sensusque ipsos, quibus tamquam interpretibus ad talia noscenda mens utitur; de his autem, quae intelliguntur, interiorem veritatem ratione consulimus, quid dici potest, unde clareat verbis nos aliquid discere praeter ipsum, qui aures percutit, sonum? Namque omnia, quae percipimus, aut sensu corporis aut mente

percipimus. Illa sensibilia, haec intelligibilia; sive, ut more auctorum nostrorum loquar, illa carnalia, haec spiritualia nominamus. De illis dum interrogamur, respondemus, si praesto sunt ea, quae sentimus; velut cum a nobis quaeritur intuentibus lunam novam, qualis aut ubi sit. Hic ille, qui interrogat, si non videt, credit verbis et saepe non credit, discit autem nullo modo, nisi et ipse, quod dicitur, videat; ubi jam non verbis, quae sonuerunt, sed rebus ipsis et sensibus discit. Nam verba eadem sonant videnti, quae non videnti etiam sonuerunt.

Cum vero non de iis, quae coram sentimus, sed de his, quae aliquando sensimus, quaeritur, non jam res ipsas, sed imagines ab iis impressas memoriaeque mandatas loquimur; quae omnino quomodo vera dicamus, cum falsa intueamur, ignoro; nisi quia non nos ea videre ac sentire, sed vidisse ac sensise narramus. Ita illas imagines in memoriae penetralibus rerum ante sensarum quaedam documenta gestamus, quae animo contemplantes bona conscientia non mentimur, cum loquimur; sed nobis sunt ista documenta, is enim, qui audit, si ea sensit atque adfuit, non discit meis verbis, sed recognoscit ablatis secum et ipse imaginibus; si autem illa non sensit, quis eum credere potius verbis quam discere intelliget?

Cum vero de iis agitur, quae mente conspicimus, id est intellectu atque ratione, ea quidem loquimur quae praesentia contuemur in illa interiore luce veritatis, qua ipse, qui dicitur homo interior, illustratur et fruitur; sed tunc quoque noster auditor, si et ipse illa secreto ac simplici oculo videt, novit quod dico sua contemplatione, non verbis meis. Ergo ne hunc quidem doceo vera dicens, vera intuentem; docetur enim non verbis meis, sed ipsis rebus, Deo intus pandente, manifestis; itaque de his etiam interrogatus respondere posset. Quid autem absurdius, quam eum putare locutione mea doceri, qui posset, antequam loquerer, ea ipsa interrogatus exponere? Nam, quod saepe contingit, ut interrogatus aliquid neget, atque ad id fatendum aliis interrogationibus urgeatur, fit hoc imbecillitate cernentis, qui de re tota illam lucem consulere non potest; quod ut partibus faciat, admonetur, cum de iisdem istis partibus interrogatur, quibus illa summa constat, quam totam cernere non valebat. Quo si verbis perducitur ejus, qui interrogat, non tamen docentibus verbis, sed eo modo inquirentibus, quo modo est ille, a quo quaeritur, intus discere idoneus; velut si abs te quaererem hoc ipsum, quod agitur, utrumnam verbis nihil doceri possit, et absurdum tibi primo videretur non valenti totum conspicere, sic ergo quaerere oportuit, ut tuae sese vires habent ad audiendum illum intus magistrum, ut dicerem: »Ea quae me loquente vera esse confiteris, et certus es, et te illa nosse confirmas, unde didicisti?«, responderes fortasse, quod ego docuissem. Tum ego subnecterem: »Quid si me hominem volantem vidisse dicerem, itane te certum verba mea redderent, quemadmodum, si audires sapientes homines stultis esse meliores?«. Negares profecto et responderes illud te non credere, aut etiam si crederes ignorare, hoc autem certissime scire. Ex hoc jam nimirum intelligeres, neque in illo, quod me affirmante ignorares, neque in hoc, quod optime scires, aliquid te didicisse verbis meis; quandoquidem etiam interrogatus de singulis, et illud ignotum, et hoc tibi notum esse jurares. Tum vero totum illud, quod negaveras fatereris, cum haec, ex quibus constat clara et certa

esse cognosceres; omnia scilicet, quae loquimur, aut ignorare auditorem, utrum vera sint, aut falsa esse non ignorare, aut scire vera esse. Horum trium in primo aut credere, aut opinari, aut dubitare, in secundo adversari atque renuere; in tertio attestari; nusquam discere. Quia et ille, qui post verba nostra rem nescit, et qui se falsa novit audisse, et qui posset interrogatus eadem respondere, quae dicta sunt, nihil verbis meis didicisse convincitur. (De Magistro. Cap. XII. Migne t. 32, p. 1216).

[15] Quamobrem in iis etiam, quae mente cernuntur, frustra cernentis loquelas audit, quisquis ea cernere non potest, nisi quia talia, quamdiu ignorantur, utile est credere; quisquis autem cernere potest, intus est discipulus veritatis, foris judex loquentis, vel potius ipsius locutionis. Nam plerumque scit illa, quae dicta sunt, eo ipso nesciente, quae dixit; velut si quisquam Epicureis credens et mortalem animam putans, eas rationes, quae de immortalitate ejus a prudentioribus tractatae sunt, eloquatur, illo audiente, qui spiritualia contueri potest; judicat iste eum vera dicere, at ille, qui dicit, utrum vera dicat, ignorat, immo etiam falsissima existimat; num igitur putandus est ea docere, quae nescit? Atqui iisdem verbis utitur, quibus uti etiam sciens posset.

Quare jam ne hoc quidem relinquitur verbis, ut his saltem loquentis animus indicetur; siquidem incertum est, utrum ea, quae loquitur, sciat. Adde mentientes atque fallentes, per quos facile intelligas non modo non aperiri, verum etiam occultari animum verbis. Nam nullo modo ambigo id conari verba veracium, et quodam modo profiteri, ut animus loquentis appareat; quod obtinerent omnibus concedentibus, si loqui mentientibus non liceret. Quamquam saepe experti fuerimus, et in nobis et in aliis, non earum rerum, quae cogitamur, verba proferri; quod duobus modis posse accidere video, cum aut sermo memoriae mandatus et saepe decursus, alia cogitandis ore funditur; quod nobis, cum hymnum canimus, saepe contingit; aut cum alia pro aliis verba praeter voluntatem nostram linguae ipsius errore prosiliunt; nam hic quoque non earum rerum signa, quas in animo habemus, audiuntur. Nam mentientes quidem cogitant etiam de iis rebus, quas loquuntur, ut tamentsi nesciamus, an verum dicant, sciamus tamen eos in animo habere quod dicunt, si usu eis aliquid duorum, quae dixi, accidat; quae si quis et interdum accidere contendit et cum accidit apparere, quamquam saepe occultum est, et saepe me fefellit audientem, non resisto.

Sed his accidit aliud genus, sane late patens et semen innumerabilium dissensionum atque certaminum, cum ille, qui loquitur, eadem quidem significat, quae cogitat, sed plerumque tantum sibi et aliis quibusdam; ei vero, cui loquitur, et item aliis nonnullis, non idem significat. Dixerit enim aliquis audientibus nobis, ab aliquibus belluis hominem virtute superari, nos illico ferre non possumus, et hanc tam falsam pestiferamque sententiam magna intentione refellimus, cum ille fortasse virtutem vires corporis vocet, et hoc nomine id, quod cogitavit, enunciet, nec mentiatur, nec erret in rebus, nec aliud aliquid volvens animo, mandata memoriae verba contexit, nec linguae lapsu aliud, quam volvebat, sonet, sed tantummodo rem, quam cogitat, alio, quam nos nomine, appellet, de qua illi statim assentiremur, si ejus cogitationem possemus inspicere, quam verbis jam prolatis explicata-

que jam sententia sua nondum nobis pandere valuit. Huic errori definitionem mederi posse dicunt, ut in hac quaestione, si definiret, quid sit virtus; eluceret, ajunt, non de re, sed de verbo esse controversiam; quod ut concedam ita esse, quotusquisque bonus definitor inveniri potest? et tamen adversus disciplinam definiendi multa disputata sunt; quae neque hoc loco tractare opportunum est, nec usquequaque a me probantur.

Omitto, quod multa non bene audimus, et quasi de auditis diu multumque contendimus. (De Magistro. Cap. XIII. Migne t. 32, p. 1218).

[16] Je cite les passages correspondants d'après l'éditon de P. Labriolle: St. Augustin, Confessiones I. Paris 1925.

Cap. VI. Quid enim est, quod volo dicere, Domine, nisi quia nescio unde venerim huc... Et susceperunt me consolationes miserationum tuarum, sicut audivi a parentibus carnis meae, ex quo et in qua me formasti in tempore, non enim ego memini. Exceperunt ergo me consolationes lactis humani, nec mater mea vel nutrices meae sibi ubera implebant, sed tu mihi per eas dabas alimentum infantiae secundum institutionem tuam et divitias usque ad fundum rerum dispositas... Nam tunc sugere noram et adquiescere delectationibus, flere autem offensiones carnis meae, nihil amplius. Post et ridere coepi, dormiens primo, deinde vigilans. Hoc enim de me mihi indicatum est et credidi, quoniam sic videmus alios infantes, nam ista mea non memini. Et ecce paulatim sentiebam, ubi essem, et voluntates meas volebam ostendere eis, per quos implerentur, et non poteram, quia illae intus erant, foris autem illi nec ullo suo sensu valebant introire in animam meam. Itaque jactabam et membra et voces, signa similia voluntatibus meis, pauca, quae poteram, qualia poteram: non enim erant veri similia. Et cum mihi non obtemperabatur vel non intellecto, vel ne obesset, indignabar non subditis majoribus et liberis non servientibus et me de illis flendo vindicabam. Tales esse infantes didici, quos discere potui, et me talem fuisse magis mihi ipsi indicaverunt nescientes quam scientes nutritores mei.

Confitebor tibi, Domine coeli et terrae, laudem dicens tibi de primordiis et infantia mea, quae non memini; et dedisti ea homini, ex aliis de se conjicere et auctoritatibus etiam muliercularum multa de se credere. Eram enim et vivebam etiam tunc et signa, quibus sensa mea nota aliis facerem, jam in fine infantiae quaerebam.

Cap. VII. An pro tempore etiam illa bona erant, flendo petere etiam quod noxie daretur, indignari acriter non subjectis hominibus liberis et majoribus hisque, ab quibus genitus est, multisque praeterea prudentioribus non ad nutum voluntatis obtemperantibus feriendo nocere niti, quantum potest, quia non oboeditur imperiis, quibus perniciose oboediretur?... Vidi ego et expertus sum zelantem parvulum: nondum loquebatur et intuebatur pallidus amaro aspectu conlactaneum suum..... Hanc ergo aetatem, Domine, quam me vixisse non memini, de qua aliis credidi et quam me egisse ex aliis infantibus conjeci, quamquam ista multum fida conjectura sit, piget adnumerare huic vitae meae, quam vivo in hoc saeculo.

Cap. VIII: Nonne ab infantia huc pergens veni in pueritiam? Vel potius ipse in me venit et incessit infantiae? Nec discessit illa, quo enim abiit? Et tamen jam non erat. Non enim eram infans, qui non farer, sed

jam puer loquens eram. Et memini hoc, et unde loqui didiceram, post adverti. Non enim docebant me majores homines praebentes mihi verba certo aliquo ordine doctrinae, sicut paulo post litteras, sed ego ipse mente, quam dedisti mihi, Deus meus, cum gemitibus et vocibus variis et variis membrorum motibus edere vellem sensa cordis mei, ut voluntati pareretur, nec valerem, quae volebam omnia nec quibus volebam omnibus. Prensabam memoria, cum ipsi appellabant rem aliquam et cum secundum eam vocem corpus ad aliquid movebant: videbam et tenebam hoc ab eis vocari rem illam, quod sonabant, cum eam vellent ostendere. Hoc autem eos velle ex motu corporis aperiebatur tamquam verbis naturalibus omnium gentium, quae fiunt vultu et nutu oculorum ceterorumque membrorum actu et sonitu vocis indicante affectionem animi in petendis, habendis, rejiciendis fugiendisve rebus. Ita verba in variis sententiis locis suis posita et crebro audita quarum rerum signa essent paulatim colligebam measque jam voluntates, edomito in eis signis ore, per haec enuntiabam. Sic cum his, inter quos eram, voluntatum enuntiandarum signa communicavi...

[17] Cfr. Ernst Cassirer, Philosophie der symbolischen Formen. I. Teil, Die Sprache. Berlin 1923: »Die moderne Sprachpsychologie hat das Problem der Sprache mit Recht dem Problem einer allgemeinen Psychologie der Ausdrucksbewegungen eingeordnet«, p. 124. Il y a là un chapitre tout entier sur le langage expressif: Die Sprache in der Phase des sinnlichen Ausdrucks. I. Die Sprache als Ausdrucksbewegung. Gebärdensprache und Wortsprache. II. Mimischer, analogischer u. symbolischer Ausdruck. Cfr. aussi Vendryès, Le langage. Paris. La Renaissance du livre. 1921, p. 8.

[18] Les linguistes et les psychologues font remarquer ce caractère du langage de l'enfant. Cfr. Ch. A. Séchehaye, Programme et méthodes de la linguistique théorique. Genève, Paris, Leipzig 1908, p. 67.

[19] La voix articulée n'acquiert l'indépendance que peu à peu. Developpée, elle reste longtemps encadrée, pour ainsi dire, dans le langage expressif, pour ne former avec lui qu'un tout. Cfr. Clara u. William Stern, Die Kindersprache. Leipzig 1920, p. 144.

[20] »On remarquera les divergences des mss. sur le mot *prensabam* — dit Labriolle (St. Augustin, Confessions I, p. 12). — *Pensabam (je considère avec soin)* paraît moins significatif et moins heureux que *prensabam* qui exprime »l'appréhension« toute spontanée des mots par la mémoire puérile. *Praesonabam (je répétais d'avance)* ne serait pas mauvais, mais implique que l'enfant sait déjà le mot et se le répète à lui-même. *Praestabat* serait aussi une leçon acceptable (ma mémoire me venait en aide)«. L'édition de Ramorino (Bibliotheca Sanctorum et Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum. Ser. VI, vol. II. Romae 1909) accepte la leçon *praesonabam*, dans ce sens: je répétais les paroles dans mon âme avant de les prononcer à haute voix.

[21] Cfr. B. Löwenfeld, Systematisches Studium der Reaktionem der Saüglinge auf Klänge u. Geräusche, p. 62—69. Zeitschrift für Psychologie CIV (1927) 1—6.

[22] K. Bühler et H. Hetzer constatent d'après les observations faites dans l'Institut psychologique à Vienne que les enfants commencent à comprendre le langage expressif des autres dès le huitième mois de leur vie.

(Das erste Verständnis für Ausdruck im ersten Lebensjahr, p. 50—61. Zeitschrift für Psychologie CVIII [1928] 1—6).

[23] Cfr. P. Guillaume, Les débuts de la phrase dans le langage de l'enfant, p. 1—25. Journal de psychologie normale et pathologique XXIV (1927) 1—10. L'auteur fait remarquer que l'enfant entend les mots dans une situation; les mots accentués et souvent répétés le frappent d'abord. La phrase commence, dès qu'il distingue les choses, les personnes les actions etc.

[24] Difficultas omnino ediscendae peregrinae linguae, quasi felle aspergebat omnes suavitates graecas fabulosarum narrationum. Nulla enim verba illa noveram et saevis terroribus ac poenis, ut nossem, instabatur mihi vehementer. Nam et latina aliquando (infans utique) nulla noveram; et tamen advertendo didici, sine ullo motu atque cruciatu, inter etiam blandimenta nutricum et laetitias alludentium.

Didici vero illa sine poenali onere urgentium, cum me urgeret cor meum ad parienda concepta sua: quae non possem, nisi aliqua verba didicissem non a docentibus, sed a loquentibus; in quorum et ego auribus parturiebam, quidquid sentiebam. Hinc satis elucet majorem habere vim ad discenda ista liberam curiositatem, quam meticulosam necessitatem. (Confessiones. Cap. XIV).

A Characterization of the Chinese National Language.

Table of contents.

IV. Grammar proper.
- A. Morphology.
  - 1. Word elements.
  - 2. Words.
    - a. *Di*, particle of subordination. b. *Le*, particle of change. c. *Je*, particle of duration. d. Miscellaneous.
  - 3. Word combinations.
- B. Syntax.
  - 1. European categories.
    - a. Number. b. Case. c. Gender. d. Numerative. e. Reference. f. Comparison. g. Tense. h. Aspect. i. Voice. j. Modality. k. Interrogation. l. Negation. m. Indirect discourse.
  - 2. Some Chinese syntactical categories.
    - a. General. b. Coördination. c. Subordination. d. Emphasis. e. Aspect.

V. Lexicon.
- A. Word migration.
- B. Reaction to foreign words.
- C. Nominality.
- D. Idiomaticalness.
- E. Assimilation of foreign words.
  - 1. Original spelling.
  - 2. Phonetic rendering.
  - 3. Logoid translation.
  - 4. Re-creation.

VI. Writing.
- A. Classes of characters.
  - 1. Symbolic characters.
  - 2. Picturographs.
  - 3. Phonograms.
  - 4. Ideographs.
  - 5. Analogical characters.
  - 6. Borrowed characters.
- B. Creation of characters.
- C. Present prospects.
  - 1. Reform?
  - 2. Paihua.
  - 3. Character limitation.
  - 4. Phonetic *hurigana*.
  - 5. Pure phonetic writing.
  - 6. Romanization.

Bibliography.

Appendix.

I. Foreword.

The present paper may be said to have had its inception in a paper prepared for Professor Rozwadowski's Seminar of Indo-European Philology (at the University of Cracow), and which deserves to be called a Seminar of General Linguistics. It was prepared for and read to mature students with special linguistic training in Slavic, Romance, Germanic, or Classical Languages. I drew as many parallels as I could from Polish and the Slavic languages. — Later I enlarged the paper and made it more technical for a lecture before the Cracow Linguistic Society, the audience this time consisting mostly of professors of linguistics. — The present paper was also written primarily for linguists and non-Sinologists, but it is not limited, as were its predecessors, to Poles. This has necessitated a change in the vehicle of expression and the drawing of examples, whenever possible, from Western European rather than Slavic languages.

Different linguists approach the subject of language with different abilities. Some are possessed of analytic minds, others are capable of far-reaching syntheses, while still others are able to acquire a practical command of languages without going very deeply into the whys and wherefores. I began foreign languages in 1914. A glance at the first ten languages studied in chronological order will show very clearly that there was little enough method in the earlier phases of my madness (Esperanto, German, Hebrew, French, Latin, Spanish, Yiddish (altho I am not a Jew), Ro, Greek, Sanskrit). To make a long story short, I will say that in 1917 my interests were definitely turned towards the Orient. I studied Japanese and Chinese privately in San Francisco before leaving early in 1923 for the Far East. — This acquisition of diverse languages was accompanied by an increasing desire to approach the nature of Language itself. Since I began teaching languages in 1917 and have taught English, German, French, Spanish, Italian, Russian, Chinese, and Japanese as well as two of the better known international language projects to pupils whose native languages ranged from Japanese and Korean thru Hindustani to Hungarian, Polish, and English (all together twenty-six languages have been represented by my pupils), I have no hesitation in subscribing to the well-known saying that *docendo*

discimus. The irrationalities, inconsistencies, idioms, and — the truth will out — idiocies of our languages have probably led more than one person to feel that »Languages were made to conceal the fact that man had no thoughts«.

A number of difficulties cropped up while I was engaged with the preliminaries of my descriptive grammar of Chinese. These difficulties are often of interest to linguistics as a whole, and the author aims in the present paper to present some of these problems to the linguistic world without being too old-fogy on the one hand or falling into the current fads on the other. One of these problems (polysyllabicity), which I shall only sketch here, has been treated in detail in an article to appear in the 1931 number of *Rocznik Orjentalistyczny* (The Polish Oriental Annual).

II. Preliminaries.

A. Limitation of Subject.

1. Indo-European vs. Chinese.

It would be relatively easy to describe Chinese from the English point of view, still easier from the Polish point of view because the differences are more palpable, but how shall we compare Chinese with such languages as Irish, English, French, German, Russian, Modern Greek, Albanian, Modern Persian, and Hindustani taken together as a unit? If we take only those features which are common to them all, we shall be left with little or nothing to work with; if we take any- and everything which we find in the Indo-European languages to-day, we shall have so much material that classification and comparison would be the work of a decade. I have limited myself almost exclusively to the Romance, Germanic, and Slavic languages and Modern Greek, because they are the best known to Western Indo-European linguists.

2. Chinese Gwoyeu II.

Another question of equal importance if we are to avoid the most serious misunderstandings is the definition of Chinese for the purposes of the present paper. The language has a longer uninterrupted history than any language living or dead and is

to-day spoken over a territory 10% larger than all Europe, and, what is perhaps still more important, there is no language spreading so rapidly at the present time as Chinese. Not only has Chinese conquered Manchuria in a generation, a territory more than twice as large as Germany, but it has also made great inroads in Polynesia and the Straits-Settlements. While two great empires fought a military war and a long economic and political one over Manchuria, the Chinese simply took possession of it. It reminds one of the two boys who quarrelled over a nut they had found. The Russian boy may have seen it first, and the Japanese boy may have picked it up, but there seems to be little doubt nowadays as to who will finally eat the Manchurian kernel. — Chinese is here taken to mean what is usually termed Northern Mandarin (*Kuan-hua*). It coincides for the most part with the National Language, which is now being so assiduously propagated in China. In the earlier stages of the National Language movement, the more conservative (from the linguistic point of view) influence of Nanking was felt to be dominant. This stage may be designated as *Gwoyeu I* (*Kuo*^{2} *Yü*^{3}). The military conquest of Peking by the Nanking Nationalist Government removed the older questions of political rivalry and jealousy and ushered in the era of the supremacy of the language of Peking, now renamed Peip'ing, or according to the Romanization scheme approved by the Chinese Government, Beeipyng. Peipingese is the heart of this new »standard language« (Gwoyeu II) just as the dialects of the Île de France and Moscow constitute the heart of French and Russian.

3. Synchronistic treatment.

A word must be added as to the method of treatment. It will be synchronistic thruout. The usual practice has been to compare the Chinese of some 2500 years ago with the present stage of one or more European languages or with the classical languages: Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin. The statement is not correct yet, however, for the grammatical structure of 2500 years ago is taken as a basis of comparison, but the words are pronounced according to the most modern and most highly developed dialect of Peiping. Just fancy reading Latin texts with every *aqua* changed to [o], every *augustus* read [u], many of the long forms of the verb

habere reduced to [ü]. Yet the Chinese who reads classical texts in his own Mandarin dialect (especially Peipingese) does this very thing. Proto-Chinese is not yet reconstructed to an extent to enable us to speak with the same certainty of its sounds and tones as we can of many features of Proto-Indo-European. We are thus constrained to treat both Chinese and Indo-European on a strictly synchronistic basis, for the usual treatment is really a case of trying to measure things which are incommensurable.

B. Sound Notation.

1. Orthography — Transliteration — Phonetic Transcription.

Three terms must first of all be carefully distinguished: orthography, transliteration, phonetic transcription. In linguistic works in the Semitic field we usually content ourselves with a text in the original letters or a transliteration. Precise phonetic transcriptions are often an uncalled-for complication. In Chinese the question was greatly complicated by the fact that there was — until recently — no Chinese alphabet which could be transliterated. Each Chinese word up to that time had to be transcribed phonetically or quasi-phonetically. Wade's system was intended as a phonetic notation. This rôle was too difficult for it to fill as it was not easily adapted to dialects other than Pekingese. In the course of time it developed into a pseudo-orthography for foreigners and as such it lost whatever value it may have possessed as a phonetic notation for transcription purposes without acquiring any of the real desiderata of a good orthography. The process of »simplification« was one of mystification. One syllable now might do duty for eight. *Pi*, for example, might mean *pi*^{1}, *pi*^{2}, *pi*^{3}, *pi*^{4}, *p‘i*^{1}, *p‘i*^{2}, *p‘i*^{3}, or *p‘i*^{4}. Such a system has done much to lead Chinese to believe that it was impossible to make their language comprehensible in Roman letters [1]. If we add to this confusion the fact that the mother-tongue of each and every Sinologist has influenced him in writing down Chinese, we shall find that there are almost as many »transcriptions« as Sinologists

---

[1] This is as bad as it would be to write all the following words *bad* in English: *bad, bed, bid, bud, bat, bet, bit, bot, but, pad, ped, pod, pud, pat, pet, pit, pot, put.*

with all falling back on Wade when they wish to reach an international public.

Sinology requires two systems of writing Chinese in Roman letters: one phonetic notation capable of providing a symbol for any sound to be found in any Chinese dialect. This system might be elastic enough to cover both »broad« and »narrow« transcription. It should be worked out in harmony with existing scientific traditions, but not necessarily S nological traditions. The sound written *sh* by Wade might be written *s*, *š*, or *ʃ*. *Hs* would be *ś*, or *ç*, depending upon the dialect. Such a system would only be necessary in beginners' manuals, in dialect and phonetic studies. It would be expensive and troublesome to print. Tone-marks would here be symbolized by arrows or lines before the syllable.

2. Advantages of Gwoyeu Romatzyh.

Another system less accurate in detail yet providing a simpler means of recording Chinese words in a standardized, normative spelling which kept close to the ideal of one phoneme — one symbol, would be sufficient for all other purposes. Such a system has been worked out by the Chinese themselves and it has received official recognition from the National Government. If China had a Kemal Pasha we should probably see this system replace the characters in daily life. As it is, however, we must consider ourselves lucky to have secured a system which should in the course of time win over all adherents of other systems. Readers who are interested in this system may be referred to »Rocznik Orjentalistyczny (1931)«, where I have dwelt on its merits at some length [1]. It is called »Gwoyeu Romatzyh« (National-Language Romanization). All Chinese words (with the exception of proper names) will be written in the GR system unless otherwise stated. In the chapter on phonology, however, all words or symbols in brackets are in a phonetic transcription familiar to Europeans.

C. Problems in Classification.

1. Relation of Grammar to Lexicon.

In Indo-European linguistics the subdivisions of grammar have caused no end of trouble. Is phonetics a part of grammar?

---

[1] See the appendix for an exposé of this system.

Should semantics be included? Does the lexical study of language belong here? In the present paper I have decided to include all these branches of linguistics.

In a language as rich in affixes as the Slavic languages are one may feel that grammar is of infinite importance while the lexical side may be studied under »word-formation«. In Chinese (as well as in English) one feels that lexical studies are of prime importance. A large part of Chinese grammar may be most easily studied in connection with the auxiliaries and particles which have lost all except grammatical significance. Some have gone so far as to state that Chinese has no grammar. It does strike one like that at first glance, but on closer examination (or still better, after extended use) one finds that such a statement would be as far amiss as that of the centipede who discovered that man had no means of locomotion. It is true that he has only two legs, but he has developed — mind and hand coöperating — a system of riding, flying, diving, and swimming which can get him around the earth in less time than a centipede can go around a small city. The centipede also everlooked the fact that man can now with his two mere legs dance in one small room for three weeks without »stopping«. Chinese grammar has fewer of the visible helps to understanding than our Indo-European languages boast of, but it also has fewer impediments in the shape of »98« useless legs when it wishes to fly. All grammarians are descendants of Procrustes: the better ones lop off the protruding feet of the foreign language while the majority sever the head.

The study of the lexicon is particularly necessary in Chinese because of the great number of set expressions taken from a rich uninterrupted history of thousands of years. One may know the grammar perfectly and not make much sense out of what one hears. This has little to do with language as such, for it is a question of cultural traditions. It is impossible for a Westerner to realize how much of what he says makes no sense unless his listener was brought up on the Hebraico-Graeco-Roman tradition. Such expression as *the handwriting on the wall*, *to wash one's hands of an affair*, *to shake the dust of a city from one's feet* convey the intended meaning to a Far Easterner only after he has heard the story of their origin [1]. The greatest difficulty in

[1] This is the principal reason why foreigners in Japan and

learning languages is just this extra-lingual factor. The fact that we usually learn languages of the same *Kulturkreis*, where this factor is reduced to a minimum, has led us to believe that the real difficulty lay in grammar.

In Chinese, then, such expressions as *sit well look sky* do not convey the intended meaning directly. *To sit in a well and look at the sky* is of course a beautiful way of saying that a person is narrow-minded. *To hew a handle* means 'to secure a go-between'. *Five clouds* means nothing more or less than 'signature'. (»My name in the Great Grass style of penmanship resembles a five-fold cloud.«) Historical allusion is, in the words of Karlgren, the Chinese national mania. One final example: The expression *ice-man* means 'go-between'. It came about in this way. Ling-hu Ts'ê had a dream. He was standing on the ice and talking to a man underneath. He asked a soothsayer what this could possibly mean. This worthy had evidently met with harder problems in his day's work, for he answered: »Above the ice, that is *yang* (male element), below the ice, that is *in* (female element). When the ice melts there will be a wedding and you will be the go-between«. And it really turned out to be true!

After this digression we may return to grammar and to words proper, leaving allusions, quotations, and idiomatic expressions aside as irrelevant to the present inquiry.

2. Morphology — Syntax.

It is customary to say that Chinese is a language without morphology, that its grammar is coextensive with its syntax. If there existed perfect agreement that morphology included only

---

China limit their linguistic attainments to talking to servants and the uneducated. The only common ground for a cultured conversation is usually with people who have a smattering of the Occident without being rooted in it. In Europe and America if we can speak the same language we can understand each other or at least come to blows over a »misunderstanding« which is all too well understood! In the Orient between the Orientals and Occidentals there is not enough »understanding« for a genuine »misunderstanding«. Everything seems evasive; every word, every sentence misses the mark. There is complete non-understanding. — The Oriental does a good nine-tenths of the work of trying to reach the Occident. This painful process of trying to understand our culture may fittingly be called the »yellow man's burden«.

flectional forms, we might subscribe to the statement above, with the reservation, however, that one or more of the particles (enclitics) has reached a stage which but for historical tradition we should have little hesitancy in describing as a flectional ending. The most frequently mentioned particle is [lə] or [lα], which is usually referred to as a quasi-equivalent of the past tense, but which we shall see later is not one particle at all but two, which happen to coincide phonetically in Gwoyeu or Northern Mandarin. (In numerous dialects, however, we find two particles: one stands immediately after the verb, the other at the end of the sentence. This difference in position corresponds to a difference in meaning in the North). It reminds one of the English plural *s* and possessive *'s* or *s'*. These endings are identical in all positions phonetically, yet they are admittedly two different endings. A still better example of a near-ending in Chinese is *-je* (Wade's *cho*), which is often equivalent to the English *-ing* of the present participle.

The only helpful line of demarcation between morphology and syntax in Chinese seems to be that drawn by Jespersen in his »Philosophy of Grammar« (p. 39 et seq.). Morphology in the present paper is simply a process of going from Form to Notion, while Syntax is the reverse process of going from Notion to the Form used in expressing it in Chinese. Every phenomenon in this way comes in for double treatment, altho one may be less detailed than the other. In Chinese grammars for Westerners a third treatment may be necessary, for syntax must be divided up into categories and our Western categories, altho convenient for reference to the Westerner, do not present Chinese in a true light. If we take, for example, our usual syntactical categories, we shall find *le* [lə] treated under »tense«, »aspect«, »mood«, »voice«. If we set up only those categories which are justified by the Chinese point of view, we shall have to treat *le* only under »aspect« and »emphasis«, for tense and voice do not exist as Chinese grammatical categories. — *Di* [di, də] is a still better example of the fundamental difference in treatment. In Western categories this little word will put in an appearance in the following: »Case«, »reference«, »comparison«, »tense«, »aspect«, »voice«, »modality« (»affirmation«, »negation«), »mood«, not to mention its frequency in word-formation where it converts nouns

into adjectives, adjectives into adverbs, verbs into participles, clauses into agent-nouns, and even serves as a copula from a strictly European point of view. The correct use of this little word is perhaps the one thing in Chinese which no Westerner has ever mastered. If we bring this particle into Chinese categories, we shall find that two suffice: relation and emphasis. It might even be possible to reduce them to one: subordination. All the uses here enumerated can be easily pressed into these two Chinese categories without violence.

3. Semantics.

Semantics is a carry-all section. Here may be found almost everything that is not clearly phonetic, syntactical, or morphological. The constitution of and the changes in meaning, homophony, the abstractness of words, the classification into parts of speech: all these must be touched upon. The first two in particular are of great importance in Chinese, or rather for our understanding of Chinese.

a. Homophony.

Homophony is in Chinese — as in French — a result of the leveling of sounds which were formerly distinct and the dropping of sounds. It is a notorious fact that some languages possess a much greater number of homophones than others. *Ceteris paribus*, this means that languages with a great number of homophones have had a longer and more dynamic development.

Altho in English the words »homophone« (rarely used) and »homonym« are usually considered to be identical in meaning we must in examining Chinese differentiate between the two. In the sequence two words are called homonyms if they are genetically one word but possess now two or more apparently unconnected or independent meanings. In Chinese the use of the same character is at least an 80% guarantee that the »words« in question have a common origin, or rather a common etymology. A good example of such a set of »homonyms« in this restricted sense is *jing:* 'warp', 'classic', 'to experience', 'to measure', 'already', 'menses'. This one »word« has some thirty meanings, but these can all be traced back to one of these six semantic bases (semantogenes). 'Menses' might be referred back to 'experience' or 'meas-

ure', 'measure' to 'warp', 'classic' thru 'sewn book' to 'warp', 'already' back thru 'experience' and 'measure' to 'warp'. — Homophones would be all those »words« which are pronounced *jing* (= Wade's *ching* in the first tone), but which are of different origin: 'great' (exalted; the capital, metropolis), 'unmixed' (fine, subtle; expert, practised; smart, ready; essence, semen; apparition), 'iris' (of the eye), 'pure' (clear, distinct; cleanse; to settle (an account)), 'turnip' (luxuriant!), 'crystal', 'banner' (to honor), 'bramble' (thorny, prickly), 'fearful' (solicitous). There are several other »words« all pronounced *jing* (in the first tone). It is almost impossible to mention a syllable used at all in Chinese which has not a few »homonyms« and several »homophones«: in the case of *yih* (i^4) a small vest-pocket dictionary gives 75 characters (probably upwards of 300 meanings) in one tone. The other three tones contribute their quota, so that all together there are 137 characters representing the same sound-complex. Now if the Chinese language were really as bad as that, it would only be a system of pronounceable signs. 137 »words« in the four tones of *i* would mean at least four or five hundred meanings. As a *tour de force* it would be possible to write a quatrain with seven words to the line using only the sound *i* in the four tones.

b. Word — Logoid.

In the preceding paragraph I have enclosed »word« in quotation marks thruout, for altho customarily called words, the units mentioned above are in reality »logoids«. No one could deny that *fire* was an English word even tho we may also say *fire-brand*, *fire-bug*, *firefly*, *fire-stone*, *fire-water*. Yet if we except the photometric unit *pyr*, which is not well known to the masses of educated people, we know that *pyr* conveys a quite definite meaning, the same as *fire*, altho not so concrete and not so readily perceived. From such words as *pyrheliometer*, *pyrochemical*, *pyrograph*, *pyrolysis*, *pyromancy*, *pyrometer*, and *pyrotechnics* we extract the meaning and as occasion arises we feel free to write *pyroscope*, *pyrostat* for new instruments with the assurance that but little mnemonic effort is required to master these new words. *Fire* is an English »word«; *pyr* is a »logoid«. This particular example shows a fairly close analogy to Chinese, except that *pyr* would be from an older stage of the same language (Chinese) and not

from a different, tho related language as is the case of *pyr* in English. In Chinese logoids are derived from native material, as they are in Modern Greek. Compare the following words of Modern Greek with their neo-classical equivalents in parentheses:

τὸ ψάρι	(ὁ ἰχθύς)	τὸ βράδυ	(ἡ ἑσπέρα)
ἐμπορῶ	(δύναμαι)	ὁ ψωμᾶς	(ὁ ἀρτοποιός)
ἡ φωτιά	(τὸ πῦρ)	μαῦρος	(μέλας)
τὸ κόκκαλον	(τὸ { ὀστέον) / ὀστοῦν)	τὸ ἀγόρι	(ὁ παῖς)
τὸ ψωμί	(ὁ ἄρτος)	ψόφιος	(νεκρός)
τὸ αὐγόν	(τὸ ᾠόν)	τὸ μάτι	(ὁ ὀφθαλμός)
τὸ ἄλογον	(ὁ ἵππος)	ζεστός	(θερμός)

The second word of each pair is a logoid for all cultural descendants of Greece and Rome. The first word of each pair is a Modern Greek word and only on the rarest occasion of any European value whatever. As soon, however, as the Greeks today wish a *mot savant*, they go back to the classical language. 'Ichthyology' is (omitting articles) ἰχθυολογία, 'pyromancy' is πυρομαντεία, 'necrology' is νεκρολογία, 'oölogy' is ᾠολογία, etc. — In Chinese we find a similar state of affairs. *Koou* does not mean 'mouth' to-day; it plays rather the rôle of *or-* in *oracle*, *oral*, *orator*, *orifice*, etc. The ordinary equivalent of *mouth* is *tzoei*. As soon, however, as it is found convenient to make a compound or a derivative, the Chinese resorts to the classical word, which now becomes a »logoid«: *koou*. *Oral* is *koou di*, not *tzoei di*. *Population* (the number of people in a given district) is in Chinese *renkoou* ('man'-'mouth'), *eloquence* is *kooutsair* ('mouth'-'talent'), *port* is *koou-ann* ('mouth'-'shore'), *a cause for complaint* is *kooushyr* ('mouth'-'solid', 'actual', 'truth'). There is in all these examples with *koou* a degree of abstractness which is never present with *tzoei*.

This tendency to associate the better-known word with the concrete (and more directly known) object, quality, or action and the less familiar word or logoid with the more abstract concept seems to be the rule in languages. Germany seems in recent years to be doing everything in her power to check this tendency, to make even the most abstruse ideas accessible to the people. The tendency is a healthy one as long as concrete objects are the center of attack. I have often felt, however, that by making ab-

stract ideas palpable to the native speaker, one gives him a false sense of intellectual security. Nothing is more natural than to say, »Ein Begriff ist eben was man begreifen kann«, yet nothing is more untrue. There are »Begriffe« which one cannot »begreifen« and that is worse than to have concepts which one cannot understand or even »conceive«.

c. Parts of Speech.

Another problem in classification which continues to occupy the attention of linguists is the division into parts of speech. The ancient Chinese had a classification which even to-day has much in its favor. There was first a division into »full words« and »empty words« and a subdivision of the former into »dead words« and »living words«. We have thus the following scheme for Chinese:

1. Full words { dead words (nomina) / living words (verba)
2. Empty words

Altho this scheme is sufficient for the classical language, the language of to-day would require a further subdivision of dead words into nouns (including derived adjectives and personal pronouns) and (underived) adjectives. This last division is based upon the different treatment of these words in the predicate. A »noun« requires a copula before it while an »adjective« never takes one before it. *Man is good* is *Ren hao* ('man-good'), while *He is a cook* reads *Ta shy tzuohfanndi* ('he-she is make-rice-er') which is in turn a shortened form of *Ta sh tzuoh fann di ren* ('He-she is *homo* who makes rice': word-order 1 2 6 5 3 4).

III. Phonology.

A. General.

1. Miscellaneous.

The Chinese language has never possessed consonant groups. Even Italian is more tolerant in this respect, for initial stops or *f* plus *r* are quite common. We must go outside the Indo-European family for a parallel (in initial position), Finnish. Affricates, however, exist in Chinese and are almost as frequent as the stops and more frequent than the fricatives. If, in the course of phonetic development, two consonants happen to meet, they are either

subject to assimilation and simplification, as [n + ɹ̥ = ɹ] as [ʂan + ɹ̥ = ʂɑɹ] or the nasality of [ɒ] is divided between the vowel and the final [ɹ]: *Shanq + erl = shanql* [ʂɑɒ + ɹ̥ = ʂa͡ą̃ɹ] [1]. *Shanql* is monosyllabic and there is no consonant group. — A Chinese called upon to pronounce *shanql* will of course make it *shanq + erl* to correspond with the etymological feel, just as an Englishman who normally pronounces both *bottle* and *bottling* as dissyllables will, when stopped, pronounce the second word with a syllabic *l* [båtl̥, båtłɪɒ *or* båtl̥ɪɒ] (syllabic l̥ in consequence of morphological feeling of separateness of suffix). Ask him the same question in connection with dividing the word at the end of the line and you will learn again that it is reduced to two syllables. As a matter of fact, it is optional which of these two pronunciations we use, the syllabic *l* being much the more common in slow and formal speech. — In the form of Chinese dealt with here the only final consonants are [n, ɒ, ɹ], the last-mentioned being the result of assimilation with loss of syllabicity. In the dialects which retain final [p˺ t˺ k˺] (where ˺ after the plosive denotes that there is no explosion), the suffix [ɹ] is not used. I am of the opinion that the disappearance of the implosive final stops in most Chinese dialects is to be attributed to this dislike for consonant groups. It is a noteworthy fact that the dialect which is most truly monosyllabic in nature (where every syllable means something) is the one where final [p˺ t˺ k˺] are retained. In Peipingese (Pekingese), however, where dissyllabic words are the rule, the gradual loss of semantic importance of each syllable taken separately facilitated the development of the implosive stops at the end of the syllable thru the intermediary stage of the glottal stop (known as the »entering tone« in Nankingese) into zero, with a distribution of the words belonging to the fifth or 'entering' tone among the other four tones, mostly the second and fourth, which are short tones in Pekingese.

2. Voice.

In respect of voice Chinese (which must always be understood as referring to Northern Mandarin, especially Pekingese, unless expressly extended to other dialects) is most similar to Dan-

---

[1] For technical reasons I have used a's here instead of ɑ's.

ish. In both languages we have one series of strongly aspirated stops and one series of devoiced stops weaker than the voiceless stops of French and without the voice of the voiced series in French. These stops as I have heard them in the mouths of native Pekingese are most decidedly not identical with the French voiceless stops, as is usually asserted. When I hear a Frenchman speak French or English, I have never misheard his [p t k] as [b d g]. But when a Chinese speaks French or Russian I have very often had the impression that the voiced and voiceless stops of those languages were confused: that his [b d g] sounded like [p t k] and that his [p t k] sounded like [b d g]. This is one of the best proofs — outside of purely experimental (i. e., mechanical) methods — that the Chinese *b d g* (devoiced) series is somewhere between the French and Russian *b d g* and *p t k*. — There are of course several differences between Danish and Chinese. The Danes have a third series of stops between their other two, which is found only in unaccented or weakly accented syllables of foreign words: *Pianist*, *Palads*; *Talent*, *Tobak*; *Kanal* (all accented on the final syllable). This third series is usually considered to be identical with English slightly aspirated *p t k* in initial position. This third Danish series is found where *b p t k* stand in final position and b e f o r e *s* (*Aksel* 'shoulder'). A f t e r *s*, however, the second Danish series is found: *spare* [sb̥āʁə], *faste* [fɑsd̥ə], *Aske* [ɑsg̊ə]. The author once asked a Dane who had spent several years in Northern China how he would transcribe certain Chinese words for a Danish public and whether he regarded the sounds as identical with the corresponding Danish sounds. The stops were in his opinion identical with the first and second Danish series mentioned above. The difference between the so-called aspirated and non-aspirated affricates, however, lay not in aspiration or the lack of it but in something else which he was unable to define. At the time I felt that this differentiation between the stops and the affricates was to be ascribed to the fact that Danish does not possess affricates. Later I came to see that the difficulty lay in the nature of the sound itself. The aspiration is incorporated with the second, fricative element and thus lengthens it. The sounds usually transcribed ts, tsʿ, ch, chʿ (the latter two only when they represent the retroflex (cerebral) affricates) represent in reality a long *t* (= Danish third-series *t*?) + a short *s*,

a short *t* + a long *s*, a long *ṭ* + a short *ṣ*, and a short *ṭ* + a long *ṣ*, respectively. These sounds are represented by *tz*, *ts*, *j*, and *ch*, respectively, in the GR system. (The last two letters represent quite different sounds when they stand before the two palatalizing vowels, *i ü*). — The *ch*, *ch‘* of Western Sinologues before the palatalizing vowels (*i*, *ü*) are treated by Professor Liu (Liou Fuhjuann) as palatal stops with the same degree of voice as indicated above for the three pairs of stops. Professor Chao (Jaw Yuanrenn) considers these two to be affricates made up of the palatal stop + the corresponding fricative [k͡ç] and [k͡ç‘], respectively. Wade's *ch* (Gwoyeu Romatzyh *j*) before the palatalizing vowels strikes my ear as being a long [k͡] + a short [ś] or Hungarian *ty* + Polish *ś*, the latter considerably shortened. Wade's *ch‘* (GR *ch*) under the same conditions is a short [k͡] + a long [ś].

3. Basis of articulation.

In respect of the positions of the organs of speech in the oral cavity, Chinese most resembles Polish in its consonants, English in its diphthongs. Its vowels are in a class by themselves.

B. Detailed.

1. Sounds.

a. Description of initials.

The following initial consonantal phonemes exist (given in the order of the national alphabet):

ḅ	p‘	m	f	ḍ	t‘	n	l	g̦	k‘	x	c͜ś	c͜ś	ś	t͜s	t͜s	ṣ	ř	t͜s	t͜s	s[1]	
b	p	m	f	d	t	n	l	g	k	h	j	ch	sh	j	ch	sh	r	tz	ts	s	(GR spelling)[2]
p	p‘	m	f	t	t‘	n	l	k	k‘	h	ch	ch‘	hs	ch	ch‘	sh	j	ts	ts‘	s	(Wade's spelling)

---

[1] For technical reasons the symbols used in this row will be replaced by the GR (Gwoyeu Romatzyh) letters of the second row whenever possible. Within parentheses, however, the twelfth, thirteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth symbols will be replaced by ć, ć‘, č, č‘, c, c‘, respectively. In this line *c* represents the palatal stop, elsewhere written *k͡* in this article.

[2] See Appendix for details of this system.

To these may be added a sort of incomplete initial [ɒ], often transcribed [ń], which is frequently heard from elderly people. The semi-vowels [i u ü] are treated with the vowels. Two other sounds [v ń] are represented by separate letters in the alphabet, altho they are no longer used in Gwoyeu. They are pronounced and written *u* (before a vowel), *n* (before *i* or *ü*). The preceding sounds are usually called initials.

b. Description of finals.

The finals are the sounds which make up the rest of the syllable. The following occur in Gwoyeu II (in the order favored by Professor Jaw):

ř ẓ i u ü	α	(o)	ə	e	ai	ei	αo	ou	an	ən	αɒ	əɒ	ɹ̥
	i̯α	(i̯o)		ie	iai		iαo	iu	iɛn	in	iαɒ	ιɒ	
	u̯α	(u̯o)	uə		uai	uei			uan	uən	uαɒ	{ uəɒ / -ʊɒ	
		(ü̯o)	üə	üe					üan	ün		iʊɒ	

The Gwoyeu Romatzyh equivalents are as follows:

y y i u iu	a	o	e[1]	ə*	ai	ei	au	ou	an	en	ang	eng	əl
	ia	io*		ie	iai*		iau	iou	ian	in	iang	ing	
	ua	uo	uo[2]		uai	uei			uan	uen	uang	{ weng / -ong	
		iue*	iue	iue					iuan	iun		iong	

The whole o-column requires a note. In GR *o* is written after the labials, but is pronounced [uə]. *Io* is replaced by *iue* or by *iau* (The pronunciation [üe] is more 'literary' while [i̯αo̤] is more colloquial). *Uo* is pronounced [ɯə]. *Üo* is also replaced by *iue*. [üə] and [üe] are distinguished by some people, but since the first may always be pronounced like the second, while the second may never be pronounced like the first, the Committee on National Language Unification recommends the second in all cases. The sound [e] occurs only in diphthongs and as an interjection. [iai] has developed thru [*iei] to [ie]. By comparing the two tables we get a better insight into the phonemic series of Chinese. The sounds in the first row are written with one letter in the national alphabet. Syllabic [ř] and [ẓ], however, are not written at all. A cerebral consonant not followed by a vowel is understood to be

followed by [ṛ̌]. The three apicals *tz*, *ts*, *s* are followed by [ẓ], if no vowel is written. — The sounds in the second row are written with two letters: *i* + the letter of the row above, whereby **iou* and **ian* undergo assimilation. — In the third or *u*-row the [ə] of [uən] is usually dropped. [uəɒ] is used initially, [ʊɒ] after any of the twenty-one initial consonants. — In the fourth or *ü*-row the [ə] is dropped in [ü] + [ən], and the *ü* of **üɒ* is analyzed, as it were, into its component elements because of the »breaking« influence of [ɒ].

Syllabic [ř] (which occurs only after ṣ̌, ř, č', č) and [ẓ] (only after s, c', c) are not met with in Indo-European languages. The acoustic effect is similar to that of Polish *y* after s, z, c, ʒ; š, ž, č, ǯ (or *mut. mut.* Russian ы), but the articulatory process is quite different. The tip of the tongue is against the gums or turned back still farther for [ṛ̌], and against the teeth for [ẓ]. The middle part of the tongue is not active in the production of these Chinese sounds. — The sound represented here by [ɹ] (an inverted *r*) is found in the general American pronunciation of accented *er*, *ur*, *ir*, *yr* not followed by a vowel and of unaccented *er*, *or*, *our*: *burn*, *fur*, *shirt*, *myrrh*, *herd*; *after*, *actor*, *honour*.

The following consonants occur in final position: [n ɒ ɹ]. [n] and [ɒ] occur only after the phonemes [a ə i u ü] or a rising diphthong. [ɹ] may follow any of the finals except [ẓ ṛ̌ i u ü -n] and final [i] of diphthongs and triphthongs. [ẓ ṛ̌] are replaced by [ə] before [ɹ], final [n] or [i] of diphthongs and triphthongs is dropped before [ɹ], an [ə] is inserted between [i u ü] and a following [ɹ]. A final [ɒ] shifts part of its nasal burden to the preceding vowel when [ɹ] is added, the rest enters into the nasalization of the [ɹ] itself. Disregarding tones as irrelevant, we find that [fɑɒ] + [ɹ] = [fa͡ą̃ɹ].

The interdependence of initial consonant and following vowel is of much greater consequence than in any Indo-European language the author knows of. The Northern Slavic languages offer the closest parallel. (Compare the dependence of Russian *i* (и) and *y* (ы) upon the preceding consonant. If it is hard (non-palatalized), we always have *y* (altho written *i* after š, ž); if soft, *i. E. g.*, syn || s'iła; byt || b'it, etc.). In Russian this interdependence is limited to *i*, *y*, while in Chinese it runs thru the whole vocalic system.

With regard to intonation Chinese is without rival in our IE group. Serbo-Croatian has only two fundamental intonations while Chinese has four. (These four are subject to bifurcation in certain dialects, which makes eight, to which the Cantonese, ever dissatisfied with plenty, add a ninth). The tones have since the dawn of history always played an important rôle in Chinese. Pekingese has by its tendency towards dissyllables considerably reduced the importance of the tones, however, and if this trend goes on for a century or so longer, we may expect to see the standard language of China reach a stage comparable to that of present-day Serbo-Croatian. (*V.* Intonation).

2. Sound groups.

a. Nature of the sound-complex.

In going over to sound-groups we see that altho there is uncertainty as to what constitutes a word, there seems to be none at all as to what constitutes a syllable. There are two ways of splitting up the syllable which have had great numbers of followers: the older method of dividing it into an initial and a final and the newer of dividing it into an initial, a medial, and a final. The older method, as used in dictionaries, might be illustrated in this way: Suppose we have a given character and wish to find its pronunciation. There are two well-known characters below it. By taking the initial of the first character and the final of the second we secure the reading of the title-character. The same system applied to English would work out thus: Given a character pronounced »cat«. Below it we might write »cup« and »hat«. The initial of the first (c) plus the final (at) of the second gives us the three phonemes of »cat«. — The earlier attempts at working out an alphabet for Chinese were based upon this bipartition of the Chinese syllable, a system which goes back almost to the beginning of our era and which is now called *faanchieh* (usually written *fantsieh*).

The national alphabet is not syllabic as in Japanese nor does it represent each sound by a letter as the European alphabets (in principle) do. It is a compromise which resulted naturally from Chinese traditions. The initial consonants are represented by single letters (as in Europe): 21 initial phonemes and 21 let-

ters to represent them. The rest of the syllable (called the »final« in the *fantsieh* system) may comprise one, two, or three sounds, e. g., *-a*, *-ua*, *-uan*. The earlier alphabetic schemes provided a single letter for each and every final. In these schemes any Chinese syllable could be written with two letters. The great number of letters necessary induced later inventors to introduce the concept of the »medial« into Chinese alphabetic writing. The medial is always one of the high vowels (*i*, *ü*, *u*) and usually non-syllabic. Now instead of a separate letter for *ia* and another for *üa* and still another for *ua*, the writer could write the medial plus the final. Any Chinese syllable could now be represented by a maximum of three letters.

A few examples chosen at random will illustrate the alphabetic representation of Chinese words (hyphens separate letters of the Chinese alphabet): b-a, p-o, m-ai, f-ei, d-e [d̥ə], t-ou, n-au, l-an, g-en, k-ang [kʻaɒ], h-eng [χəɒ], j-i, ch-i-a, sh-i-e, jy, *jong* is written j-u-eng, ch-u-o, sh-u-a, r-u-ei (written *roei* in GR, because of the third tone), tz-u, ts-u-an, sy, ts-u-en, i, i-a, i-n (written i + en), a, e [ə], *el [ɹ̩], u, u-o, u-eng, iu-n (written [ü + ən]).

The National Alphabet elaborated in 1913 and finally authorized in November 1918 was based upon a tripartite division of the syllable. In this way the number of separate letters necessary was reduced from the 62 to 116 of previous projects to 40, of which three are no longer used in Gwoyeu, thus a total of 37 letters. There are 21 initials, 3 medials, and 13 finals. There are five possible combinations:

1. Initial + final (f-a) } the most frequent
2. Initial + medial + final (sh-u-a) } the most frequent
3. Final alone (an)
4. Medial alone (i)
5. Medial + final (i-a)

Any Chinese syllable can be written in this alphabet with from one to three letters.

b. Assimilation.

Considering the natural obstacles to assimilation in short words where every sound is of such importance, we must say that assimilation has played a great rôle in Chinese. Within the

syllable we see that there is not a single consonant which can stand before all the vowels and not a single vowel which can stand after all the consonants. The 'labials' (b̥ pʻ m f) never stand before [r̥, z̥, ü, ia, ə] (unless followed by [n] or [ɒ]), any of the diphthongs or triphthongs beginning with *u*, or before [iαɒ, ɹ̥]. The labio-dental *f* is still further restricted, for it never stands before *i* or *i̯* of diphthongs and triphthongs. — The dentals (d̥ tʻ n l) never stand before [r̥, z̥, ɹ̥] (each of the four has other missing combinations, but we are taking only those of a wider significance). — The velars (g̥ kʻ x) never stand before [r̥, z̥, i, ü] (or any combination beginning with *i* or *ü*) [ɹ̥]. — The palatals stand only before *i* and *ü* and combinations beginning with these sounds. — The cerebrals never stand before [z̥, i, ü (or i̯, ü̯), ɹ̥]. The »apicals« (c, cʻ, s) never stand before [r̥, i, ü] or [i̯, ü̯]. — By comparative and historical methods we can easily ascertain that assimilation within the syllable has brought about this state of relative interdependence between the initial and the final. Russian offers the nearest parallel among the better-known European languages, altho the Russian relations are much simpler.

Assimilation between syllables was subject to peculiarly great obstacles. As long as the etymological force of each syllable was felt assimilation could hardly take place, because the syllables would have been made ambiguous or meaningless by the slightest alteration in the sound-content. With the development of exponents and suffixes the road to intersyllabic assimilation was made clear. The suffixes *tz* [cz̥] and *l* [ɹ] often lead to assimilation. The first is assimilated in voice to the final (voiced) sound of the root-word preceding it: [bəndzz̥]; the second alters the preceding root-syllable in certain cases. (Cf. pages 52, 56).

When [tʻ i̯ɛn] becomes [tʻ i̯αɹ], it would be more correct from the Chinese point of view to say that in the first case there is assimilation of [α] to [ɛ] under the influence of a preceding *i* and a following *n* and that in the second the original ('normal') [α] comes into its own again, for the backward pull of the [ɹ] is stronger than the forward and upward pull of the [i]. In this connection it might be well to mention that the two older consonantal endings exercise a different influence on the preceding vowel. Compare [lan] and [lαɒ], [xən] and [xəɒ] (where the first *ə* is more forward than the second), [lin] and [lɪɒ], [li̯ɛn] and [li̯αɒ],

[luən] and [loɒ] for which Peiping has [lun] and [luɒ] with advanced and retracted varieties of *u*, respectively, [ün] and [iuɒ], where [ɒ] has a dispalatalizing effect on the vowel which changes its nature.

The assimilation of *jeh* [čə] + [i] in [čei̯] is due to the frequent use of *i* (one) after *jeh* (this). Since 'this' in Chinese is usually followed by a numerative and quite often by 'one', it has by assimilation become *jey* [čei̯] and by analogy this *jey* tends to be used where no *i* is necessary. Close association with 'this' has led 'that', *nah*, [nɑ] to be pronounced [nei] in informal speech. This latter example belongs to »analogy« rather than »assimilation«. The vulgar pronunciation of these two words is with [ai̯], where dissimilation within the diphthong has taken place. In frequently used compound words the final nasal of an internal syllable becomes *m* before a following labial: [cəmə] ⟸ [cəɒ + mə] *how*, [ṣəmə] ⟸ [ṣəɒ + mə], [k'əmb̥and̥i], etc. — Another example of the assimilation of a final (in syllable) nasal consonant in the interior of a word is the Chinese equivalent of 'because' *in* + *wey*. With regard to degree of openness this *n* is assimilated to the following semivowel. There is only a movement of the tongue in the direction of the alveoli, followed by a withdrawal to the back. This incomplete *n* is acoustically similar to the Japanese sound transcribed as final (in syllable) *n* before *w*: Han'wa. Polish *ń*, which before fricatives is lowered to a non-syllabic nasalized i [i̯]: *państwo* [pai̯stfo], seems to be the nearest approach in Europe.

3. Intonation.

a. General.

Intonation is one of the most alluring sides of Chinese grammar and has received full treatment at the hands of linguists. The present chapter only sketches the situation and adds a few corrections not generally known outside Sinological circles.

The »National Language« of China bears many of the earmarks of an artificial language. In the early stage of this »language« (which lasted until the Nationalist Government at Nanking got all China pretty much under its rule) the question as to how many tones it should possess occupied the minds and tempers of people. One party was in favor of retaining the four basic tones

of Classical Chinese. This proved too difficult, however, for who knew how they were to be pronounced? Some living dialect would have to be taken as a basis, for altho the four classical tones are kept straight in poetry on paper thruout China, in practice the rising tone of one district corresponds to the falling tone of another, the high level tone of one to the low level or rising tone of another. Professor Chao (Jaw Yuanrenn) gives an interesting table to illustrate a few of these difficulties:

	I	II	III	IV	V
Peiping	¯jong	/hwa	_/hao	\dah	—
Tientsin	_tzong	¯\hwa	/hao	\dah	—
Kaifeng	/jong	\hwa	¯/hao	~dah	—
Chungching	¯tzong	_hwa	¯\hao	/dah	—
Wuchang	/tzong	_\/hwa	\hao	/dah	—
Nanking	_jong	_/hwo	—hao	¯doh	¯gueq
Kuoyü (Gwoyeu)	¯jong	/hwa	_hao	\dah	¯guoq

Another party was in favor of taking the Peipingese tones just as they were. Peiping has four tones which are direct descendants of the first three classical tones with the first classical tone split into two. The fourth classical tone is in this dialect distributed among the four Peiping tones with the vast majority in the second and fourth. This absence of the fourth classical tone-class prevented the adoption of the capital scheme. A compromise formula was found. The National Language should have five tones, the number possessed by Nanking. The first four tones were to be pronounced like the corresponding tones in Peiping [1], and the fifth was to be pronounced as in Nanking, and in those words which have this tone in the Nanking dialect. This solution does not seem to have pleased anybody. In practice people managed to learn the sounds of the National Language and began to use them with the tones of their native dialect or those of Peiping. The irony of fate willed it that with the re-

[1] There was a minor difference in the third tone. Peipingese had a low level tone with a rise at the end. If followed by an unaccented syllable the third tone was a deep level tone with the rise in the unaccented syllable following. In Gwoyeu the tone-scheme was simplified by dropping the rise irrespective of the following syllable.

moval of the capital to Nanking, the old capital (Peiping) should finally establish its tone system upon the National Language.

b. Description.

The first tone then is a long, high, level tone; the second a short rising tone; the third a long, low, level tone; the fourth a short falling tone. Professor Chao exemplifies them as follows:

1. »Sing--« as if announcing a *sol* or a high *do* to start a chorus going;
2. »What!!« a sarcastic or surprised reply to an uncalled-for remark;
3. »W-e-l-l---« an indecisive drawling kind of »well«;
4. »Now!« a decisive command to begin, after having previously given a warning signal »Ready!«

c. Tone changes.

The trend towards dissyllabicity has lessened the importance of the tone of the second part of exponent compounds. Unaccented syllables are in Chinese treatises called »light-toned«. The particles are also »light-toned«. The question of intonation is closely connected with stress.

There are a few logoids which may be pronounced in two or more tones. In a very few cases the difference in tone corresponds to a difference in grammatical function, but this seems to be only a relic from very ancient times. It is a question of the greatest historical importance, but of very little connection with the aims of the present paper. In the case of *i, bu, ba* the tone depends upon the environment. In isolation they are in the first tone, before the fourth tone they are in the second, in all other cases they are in the fourth if accented, in the »light tone« if unaccented.

4. Stress.

a. Syllable stress.

Stress in Chinese must be considered under four headings: syllable stress, word stress, sentence stress, and rhetorical stress.

Stress within the syllable is more complicated in Chinese than in European languages because of the lengthening and shortening influence of the tones. The diphthongs may be divided into two classes. First, the real diphthongs from the historical

point of view are accented on the first component. They are written with one letter in the new Chinese alphabet. They are: [ai̯ αu̯ ei̯ əu̯]. This pattern is disturbed, however, by the fact that an accented [ə] is very unstable. Theoretically this [əu], which is really found in some dialects, could develop in four directions. If lowered, it would easily be confused with [αu̯]. If raised, it would tend to become a long [u], for a diphthong composed of two high vowels (*iu* or *ui*) usually leads to monophthongization or dissimilation, and a raised [ə] would be something in the nature of a Russian *y* (ы) and hence form [yu]. The Chinese evolution was simpler: it made the first element [e] in some dialects, [o] in others (including Peiping), and left it unchanged in still others. — Second, the pseudo-diphthongs (written with two letters in the National Alphabet) are (all subsidiary members of phonemes being omitted): [iα ie io; ua ɯə üə üe] and may be accented upon the first or second component. If on the second the first becomes a semi-vowel. [iα] is almost always accented on the second component; [ie] on the first or second (if followed by *n*, with very few exceptions on the second). *Io* is supplanted by *üe* or *iau* in the usual language of to-day. In *ua* the accent falls on the *a*. In *uo* the first component is accented with the single exception of *gwo* (country). In *iue* [üə], usually replaced by [üe], the *ü* is accented. In [üæ] (GR *iua*, Wade *üa*), always followed by *n*, the [æ] is nearly always accented.

Chinese possesses the following triphthongs: [iai] (rare, usually replaced by *ie*), [i̯αu̯, u̯ai̯, u̯ei̯] the last often pronounced [ui], and [i̯ou̯], generally pronounced [iu] in Peiping. These are all accented on the middle vowel [1].

b. Word stress.

Word-stress in Chinese was first studied systematically by Arendt. Since the publication of his »Handbuch der nordchinesi-

---

[1] Here again we see that the normal assimilatory influence comes from the end of the syllable (regressive assimilation): An older *iai* has developed thru **iei* to *ie*. *Iau* and *uai* are the most stable triphthongs. They make as it were a complete tour of the mouth. *Uei* is pronounced *ui* in the first two tones in Peiping, i. e., the final *i* pulls *e* towards it. *Iou* has gone still further, for the *u* has already completely absorbed the *o* in Peiping, except in a few words.

schen Umgangssprache« Sinologists have limited themselves to finding exceptions to his rules. Thirteen general rules which have the fewest exceptions have been formulated as follows:

1. Reduplicated nouns are always accented on the first syllable: *ˈgege*;

2. Reduplicated adjectives are always accented on the second syllable: *kuayˈkuay*, *jongˈjong*;

3. Onomatopoetic words (if not used nominally or verbally) are always accented on the second syllable: *geˈdang* ('tick-tock'), *haˈha* ('the sound of laughter', but *ˈhaha*, 'a joke which provokes loud laughter', 'a side-splitter');

4. Three-syllable nominal (substantival or adjectival) expressions or words, provided the last component is a substantive or adjective, accent the first and third syllables with the primary accent usually on the third: *harn-shuu-ˈbeau* ('thermometer');

5. In phrases composed of a cardinal numeral plus a noun, the accent is on the latter; if an ordinal plus a noun, the stress is on the former: *ell-ˈren* ('two persons' = 'father and mother'), but *ˈell-yueh* ('second month' = 'February');

6. If the object comes after the verb it takes the accent (the personal pronoun objects are exceptions): *shiee-ˈtzyh* ('to write (characters)'), *shuo-ˈhuah* ('to speak (a speech)');

7. In dwandwa compounds the accent is on the second syllable: *bii-ˈmoh* ('writing brush (and) india ink'), *dong-ˈshi* ('East (and) West') (Cf. *ˈdongshi* = 'thing', 'object');

8. An important exception to the foregoing rules is constituted by words used in a figurative sense: *renˈren* ('everybody', lit. 'man-man'), *ˈleangkooutz* ('married couple', lit. 'two-mouth-nominal suffix'), *ˈdongshi* ('thing', lit. 'East-West'), *shyrˈfen* = 'ten parts', *ˈshyrfen* = 'very';

9. If two synonyms (usually logoids) are united to form one concept, the first syllable is usually accented: *ˈdawluh* ('road'), *ˈperng-yeou* ('friend'), *ˈkannjiann* ('see'). Numerous exceptions;

10. Particles (auxiliaries, prepositions, etc.) are not accented: *yaw ˈlai* ('will come')' *ˈna lai* ('bring', lit. 'take come'), *ˈtzuoh shiah* ('sit down');

11. Suffixes are never accented: *ˈhairtz* ('child'), *ˈchitz* ('wife') but compare *chi-ˈtzyy* ('wife and children'), *ˈshyrtou* ('stone');

12. In dissyllabic proper names the second syllable is always accented: *San'guey Gwo'farn*;

13. If a dissyllabic compound is made up of a qualifier and a qualified (*déterminant* and *déterminé*, respectively), no definite rule can be formulated. In each particular case the accent is usually fixed and must be learned with the word.

c. Sentence stress.

Sentence stress in Chinese is similar to the same phenomena in modern Indo-European languages of my acquaintance: The object is normally accented: *Woo yeou 'shu* (Cf. the English equivalent: 'I have a 'book'). The verb is accented if there is no object. The copula is not accented. (The copula is expressed only if the predicate is a substantive). *Ta sh 'binqren*: 'He's a 'sick man'.

d. Rhetorical stress.

Rhetorical stress is where the individual has a little leeway in language. This leeway is like poetical license, however, in that even this freedom is conditioned by the laws of the language. It is bondage with invisible fetters. — Let us take Arendt's example: *sangwo* ('the three states') or *shyrgwo* ('the ten states'). If accented on the second syllable they refer to a definite group of three and ten states, respectively, known in Chinese history. If the two are brought into one sentence for contrast, however, the stress shifts to the first syllable, the distinctive part. (»This event belongs to the period of the 'three and not to that of the 'ten states«). In English this rule is without exception. Thus the verbs *im'port* and *ex'port* are accented on the first syllable in the sentence: »China 'imports more than she 'exports«. Some have stated that the ease with which the stress shifts here is due to the existence of cognate substantives with stress on the first syllable: *'export*, *'import*. As a matter of fact, however, all words follow this same rule. — In at least one important IE language this »natural« law does not obtain: Russian. Altho some of our communist friends might insist that this lack of individual freedom in shifting the accent points to the close harmony between communism and the Russian psyche, I prefer to seek the causes in the following purely linguistic features: First, the mobility of the stress in Russian is often of morphological significance, which

is very seldom the case in English, and second, the Russians have a number of particles which may serve the same purpose as the intensive or shifted stress in English (*že, ved'*, etc.). Russian reminds a Western European of Greek in this respect.

IV. Grammar proper.

A. Morphology.

As mentioned above (II C 2) each fact in Chinese grammar will be treated three times. First we shall take the forms found in Chinese and try to find their meanings; next we shall take the usual Occidental grammatical categories and rearrange the Chinese phenomena here as best we may, and lastly to clear up the relations between form and concept (or maybe to make confusion worse confounded!) we shall try to look at these same phenomena with Chinese eyes.

1. Word Elements.

Our IE technical vocabulary is of little value here. In Chinese the expressions »root«, »stem«, »thematic vowel« have no place and even »word« is more often than not misleading. There are no prefixes, or rather there are no reasons in Chinese for treating them otherwise than as first components of compounds. There are a few suffixes and they are being added to more words every year. »Prefixes« in Chinese leave the following »root« unchanged phonetically, which is similar to the state in IE languages where cutting off the prefix leaves a word. Suffixes, however, often effect phonetic changes in the »root« or in the suffix itself. In Chinese the custom has been to call all monosyllables words. Even the suffixes are put on the same footing and transcribed in their full etymological tone and phonetic value. This has helped keep up the fiction of Chinese being a language of unchanging monosyllables. Sinologists have in this respect treated their subject as the Anglo-Saxons treat the colored man: If he shows the same abilities in every respect, he is still different, because he is (undeniably!) black. Chinese has suffixes to-day, but since she did not always possess these earmarks of Indo-European aristocracy, these suffixes are somehow not suffixes

because... they make dissyllables of monosyllables. — In Chinese we must distinguish between 'word', 'logoid', and 'suffix'.

A Chinese word may consist of a single monosyllable, *lai* (come); a monosyllable + suffix *juotz* (table); a dissyllable *meiguey* (rose), where no analysis has been able to ascribe any meaning to either of the syllables taken separately; a »compound« of two or more logoids *fuhchin* ('father'; Classical Chinese *father* + *relative*); a »compound« of two or more logoids with added suffix. A word such as *neuhairtz* 'girl' is hard to classify. If *neu* and *hair* are looked upon as logoids, then it belongs here. It would also be possible to consider *hairtz* as belonging to the *juotz*-class with a prefixed *neu* ('female'; Cl. Ch. *neu* 'woman'). In any case we do not find anything which very closely resembles a flectional ending.

2. Words.

Here we must consider words of grammatical importance such as *di*, *le*, *je*, *lai*, *chiuh*, *guoh*, *chiilai*, *laije*, *shanq*, *shiah*, *der*, *dang*, *daa*, *kai*, *daw*, *jiow*.

a. *Di*, the particle of subordination.

The basic meaning of *di* is that of subordination in the broadest sense of the term. Now since subordination between two nouns is usually effected by means of the genitive or a genitive-equivalent such as *of*-phrases in English, *di* between two substantives may translate the European genitive or its analytic equivalent: *Woo di fuhchin di shu:* 'my father's book' (lit. I *di* father *di* book). The personal pronoun is in Chinese treated as a noun, except in its accentuation. Another difference is that before names of members of the family the *di* is often omitted after the personal pronouns. In this sentence then the first *di* is usually omitted, while the second never is. In English it is also possible to say *the book of my father* with the modified before the modifier, altho it is not possible to go still farther and say: *the book of the father of me.* This latter form is possible in Dutch, altho not much used because of the reluctance to make a sentence over-cumbersome. In Chinese word order the modifiers must precede the modified. In languages which resort easily to compounding we find that compounding is most often a means of suppressing a relation which might otherwise be expressed

by a preposition: 'well-water' is 'water *from* a well'. In Chinese also this formal element (*di*) is supressed when the meaning is clear without it and when there is no particular need for emphasis. We all feel that *well-water* is not quite so explicit and emphatic as *water from a well* and that the latter is weaker than *water from the well*.

A second use of *di* is as relative pronoun or subordination of a clause to a noun: *Ta may di dongshi*: 'a thing which he sells' (*or* 'sold') (lit. he-she sell which thing); *lai di ren*: 'a person who has come' (*or* 'is coming') (lit. come which person). In the case of intransitive verbs this construction of a verb plus *di* is often practically equivalent to an active (present, past, or future) participle. (Cf. German *ein kommender Mensch*, *ein gekommener Mensch*). In the case of transitive verbs it may be equal to our passive (present, past, or future) participial adjective: *Ta may di dongshi* might also be translated *the things sold (being sold, to be sold) by him. The man selling things is a German* is possible in English, but a full clause is the rule. The Chinese translation would read: *May dongshi di nah-ge ren sh Dergworen* or better *Nah may dongshi di ren sh Dergworen* (lit. that sell thing *di* person is German). If the context does not suffice to make the tense or voice clear, the Chinese possess the following devices among others for lending greater precision: *je* is inserted between the verb and *di* to express a state or continuity of action, or in practice the present tense: *tzuoh-je di ren*: 'a sitting person' (lit. sit-ing *di* person), for *tzuoh di ren* might also mean 'a person who had been sitting'. — *Guoh* expresses an act which occurred at least once in the past: *tzuoh-guoh di ren*: 'a person who had sat down'. This *guoh* is etymologically a verb which means *to pass thru* or *over*. — The passive voice may be formed by the insertion of *suoo* before the verb: *suoo tzuoh di* ('done').

A third use of *di* which follows from its use as a relative and as a participle is to form an agent-noun. *Mayshudi* (lit. sell book *di*) is in reality the relative construction without the »antecedent«. If we say *may shu di ren* this becomes evident. This latter expression is regarded in Chinese as an equivalent of the former, as a usually over-explicit statement.

Di at the end of a sentence after a verb forms an indefinite aspect which is usually made definite by adverbs of time or the

context and which generally has past meaning. Chao calls it a past indefinite, because it often corresponds to the French passé indéfini. It certainly is indefinite in that this form may express almost any aspect except the inchoative or terminative. The most helpful way to think of this »tense« is to consider it as a shortened form of the *ren*-construction mentioned above. *Woo sh leangdeanjong lai di* is simply the same as *Woo sh leangdeanjong lai di ren.* The first sentence is usually translated 'I came at two o'clock' and the second more literally 'I am one who came at two o'clock (lit. I am two-o'clock come *di* person). Compare the question *Nii tzwotian tzuoh sherme di* 'What did you do yesterday?' (lit. you yesterday do what *di*?) with the answer *Woo niannshu di* 'I was studying' (durative aspect).

Di after a monosyllabic adjective acts as an intensive: *hao shu* 'a good book' but *hao di shu* 'a good sort of book' (lit. good *di* book, where the word *good* is the predicate and *di* the relative pronoun and *book* the antecedent, in other words *a book which is good*).

Di after adjectives and without a following noun serves to form the so-called neuter adjective or substantivized adjective: *hao di* '(the) good', 'das Gute'.

Di also acts as an introducer of a »predicate adverb«. The Chinese equivalent of *He speaks very good Chinese* or *He speaks Chinese very well* is *Ta shuo di Jonggwohuah heen hao* (lit. he speak *di* Middle-Country-language very good *or* the Chinese which he speaks is very good).

If an adjective is qualified by an adverb, *di* must be inserted between the now dissyllabic adjective and the modified noun: *heen hao di shu* 'a very good book'. Here again we must take this to mean 'A book which is very good'.

Di is used to form adverbs of manner. Sometimes a simple adjective or adverb is doubled before adding *di*: *charngcharng di* ('always', 'continually'); sometimes the suffix *-l* is inserted before the *di*: *kuaykual di* ('rapidly', 'quickly'), *mannmhal di* ('slowly')[1]; a compound adjective is doubled, each component separately:

[1] In compound adverbs of this type the tone of the second component is subject to the following rules: A second-tone syllable retains its tone, the other three tones appear in the *second* component as a first tone.

gonggongjinqjinq di ('respectfully'); an adjective is joined to a substantive with or without *-l*: *dahshengl di* ('in a loud voice', lit. big voice nominal-suffix *-l, di*): a verb with any addition: *bujuh di* ('unceasingly', lit. not stop *di*), *yonqshin di* ('enthusiastically': use heart *di*).

Other minor uses may be found, but this much will show that one single particle may carry a load equal to one-fourth of English grammar — and without the slightest ambiguity.

b. *Le*, particle of change.

One particle, pronounced *leau* as a principal verb but weakened to *le* as a particle, is usually looked upon as the mark of the past tense. One of the chief causes of this misunderstanding is the fact that Western European languages do not possess aspects (except as subsidiary phases of tenses) and the Orientalists of the Slavic countries who have studied Chinese have followed the Western European sinologists in this respect.

Le at the end of the sentence expresses the inchoative aspect. Chao (Jaw Yuanrenn) calls this »sentence-*le*«. *Ta lai le*: 'He (or she) has come' (he-she come begins-to). Since, however, the inchoative and perfective aspects of intransitive verbs of motion are not easily distinguished, this sentence-*le* also serves as the perfective aspect. Chao (op. cit., p. 152) gives the following example: *Shinqkuei jeh shyrhowl woomen li nah-ge ren yiijing bu yeuan le* 'Fortunately we were no longer far from the man' (lit. fortunately this time we separated-from the man already not far begin-to-be). If we write the same sentence without the final *le*, it would mean simply that we were near the man. As it stands, it expresses a change in state, i. e., we had approached him.

Sentence-*le* plus verbal-*le* (which follows immediately upon the verb even when the latter is not at the end of the sentence) renders the past tense of transitive verbs, while sentence-*le* alone expresses the inchoative aspect. Compare *woomen shianntzay yaw chy-fann le* 'We shall now begin to eat' (lit. we now wish eat-rice begin-to) and *woomen shianntzay chy le fann le* 'We have just eaten'.

Verbal *le* in dependent clauses expresses 'when' (in the sense of immediate sequence: *woo chy le fann, jiow tzoou* 'When I have eaten I shall go' (lit. I eat perfective-particle meal then

go). We observe a close parallel with Russian and Polish: *Skoro ziadłem (obiad), to pójdę* (where the two verbal forms of this over-literal translation are perfective, the first a past active participle, the second a perfective present form with future meaning).

c. *Je*, particle of duration.

A third form of interest is *je*, which forms the durative aspect of Chinese verbs: *jann* 'to stand'; *jannje* '(to be) standing'; *tzuoh* 'to sit down'; *tzuohje* 'to sit' or 'to be sitting'; *taang* 'to lie down'; *taangje* 'to be lying down'. (This last example is not an ideal one for the foreign speaker of English, who more often than not does not know that we tend to add the 'down' even when the state is expressed. This exponent 'down' (also 'up') is often added to 'sit' as well. In the latter case it can only be for greater clearness and is not so frequent. In the first case the *down* serves to keep *lie* in the German sense of 'liegen' apart from the homonym *lie* ('lügen'). *Kai* 'to open' (trans.), *kaije* 'to stand open', *kai le* 'to open (of itself)'. This last is used of water when it begins to boil. Generally speaking, it is not used so much of an action as of a state.

d. Miscellaneous.

Most of the other words used grammatically carry much more of their original meaning with them. The infinitive of purpose is expressed by *lai* 'come' or *chiuh* 'go'. *Lai* and *chiuh* are frequently used as auxiliary verbs to express motion towards or away from the speaker. They correspond to the German *her* and *hin*, respectively. Sometimes they only add definiteness to the principal verb: *tzuoh-shiah-chiuh*, *jann-chii-lai* mean 'to sit down', 'to stand up'. Without the third components the meaning would be the same, yet the auxiliaries add a nuance of definiteness and refer to one single act: they are unifactual, Polish *jednokrotny*.

3. Word combinations.

Word order is of great grammatical importance in Chinese. The most general rule is that the modifier always stands before the modified. The most natural order is: subject (with all its preceding modifiers), adverbs of time and place, verb, object, final particles. It often happens that the logical

subject, adverbs of time or place, or the object is especially emphasized. In this case it may be taken from its normal setting and placed at the head of the sentence. The object is often provided with a prefixed particle *baa*, when it stands at the head of the sentence. This emphatic position is what is often called the absolute case. It is very common in Japanese, too (*wa*-case). — The subject of intransitive verbs may also stand after the verb. Since there is no possibility of confusion in the case of intransitive verbs the dominating psychological element comes first. In the sentence: *The ship* (previously referred to or expected) *has come*, the Chinese put *ship* before *come*; in *A ship has come*, the order is reversed. — Attributive adjectives are before the noun, predicate adjectives after it. Adjectives of quantity in the predicate are often illogically followed by their noun in English. Chinese is more consistent here: *I have few books* really means *The books which I have are few (in number).* In Chinese: *Woo yeou di shu shao* (I have *di* book few = 'the books which I have are few (in number)'). In other words, I am talking not about the books, but about the fewness of my books. — If the adverb is the essential part of the predicate it comes after the verb: (Chao, op. cit., p. 134) *joan duo idean* 'turn a little m o r e' while *duo joan idean* 't u r n a little more'.

B. Syntax.

1. European categories.

a. Number.

After six years of correcting Far Eastern students' English, French, German, and Russian themes I can affirm that the category of number is one of the hardest for Chinese and Japanese to master. I was also able to learn how many absurdities we have to commit because of this category. When we say *Man is mortal*, we mean neither that one man is mortal nor that men are mortal but that the species *homo* without reference to number is subject to death. Chinese is capable of expressing the singular of *man* unambiguously by using the equivalent of *a* or *one* before the neutral number *ren*. If, however, *man* is definite, the equivalent of *the*, *nah* + *ge*, an unstressed demonstrative ('that') plus the numerative *ge* (usually replaced by *shie* in the plural, if there

are no o t h e r indicators of plurality) is used. After numerals and such words as *several*, *few*, *many* the expression of the plural is wholly unnecessary and in Chinese and Japanese (as in Hungarian) it is never expressed. This leaves then for 99% of the cases the neutral-numbered *ren*.

There is a tendency everywhere to give human beings preferential treatment in language and in Chinese there is a »plural« particle (always unaccented) which may be added to nouns (including personal pronouns) which refer to persons: *woomen* 'we' (*I + particle*); *shianshengmen* 'teachers'. There is one fundamental difference, however, which deserves emphasis: *-men* is not added to each word in a series of plurals, but only at the end of the list. 'Teachers and pupils' is *shiansheng-shyuesheng-men* ('and' is not expressed).

Since neither verbs nor adjectives agree with nouns in Chinese, the category of number is here never expressed.

b. Case.

The case relations are expressed by the word order (nominative before the verb or after it as predicate noun, genitive before the modified noun, accusative after a transitive verb, absolute at the head of the sentence, adverbial between the subject and predicate) or by particles (genitive *di*, accusative *baa* in some cases before the verb). The dative is formed by placing the indirect object (often omitted if it can be deduced from the context) between the verb and the direct object if it is not to be emphasized, after the direct object if it is. After the verb *give* (Cf. the European name of this case: dative) it has no special form. After other verbs it may have *geei* ('give') before it as a sort of preposition. *Geei woo chyan* 'give me (some) money' ('donnez-moi de l'argent'); *baa chyan geei woo* 'give me the money' ('donnez-moi l'argent'). *Woo gawsuh ta jeh-ge huah le* 'I told him this (I tell he-she this speech finish)'. Furthermore the dativus commodi is often distinguished from the dativus incommodi by the word order: *Ta may geei woo le* 'He sold it t o me'; *ta geei woo may le* 'he sold it o n me') i. e., he sold my things for me without my permission or at a loss to me). [Arendt, *Einführung*, p. 428]. — Such other cases as exist are expressed by means of prepositions, which are really verbs if they stand before

the governed noun, and nouns if they stand after it. These latter prepositions are in reality nouns in the genitive case.

c. Gender.

Chinese has probably the fewest words of any language which are limited to one sex. In the classical language there was still a fairly large number of words which could be applied only to males or to females. To-day such words are reduced to a minimum. Even *boy* and *girl* are *male-child* and *female-child*, respectively. The central idea seems to be that for all those relations which strike us as being fundamentally different because of sex separate words are available: father, mother, husband, wife, son, daughter (the distinction between the last two is of much greater importance from the very moment of birth than it is in Europe or especially in America), etc. In the case of the professions, however, and of animals, the difference is expressed only when necessary. *Nan* (originally vir) 'male' and *neu* (etymologically 'woman') 'female' are prefixed. A different set of prefixes is available for animals, *gong* and *muu*, respectively. There is of course not a shadow of »grammatical gender«.

d. Numerative[1].

There must, however, always be a fly in the grammatical ointment. The Chinese do not say *der Tisch*, *die Wand*, and *das Mädchen*, but they do classify almost all concrete nouns and a few abstract ones according to some real or imaginary characteristic. These »numeratives« (classifiers, numerary adjuncts) are occasionally used as an indefinite article, but never at the head of a sentence. Usually, however, they are inserted between a numeral or a demonstrative and a following noun. There are all together about a hundred numeratives, but only twenty-five of frequent occurrence. A few examples will make their meaning and use clear:

ge ('individual'): *i-ge ren* 'one person'. This is the most general numerative and it may take the place of others on occasion. It is so common in Peiping that the coolies count *ige*, *ellge*, *sange*, etc. instead of *i, ell, san,* etc.

---

[1] The numerative should strictly speaking be included under Chinese categories. It is treated here because of the Sinological traditions behind it.

jang ('extend'): *jii-jang juotz* 'how many tables'? Used for articles with a flat, extended surface.

baa ('take'): *jeh-baa yiitz* 'this chair'. Used for objects with a handle or a »back«.

jy ('twig'): *nah-jy chianbii* 'that pencil'. Used for long cylindrical objects.

jy ('single'): *naa-jy shoou* 'which hand?' Used for one of a pair.

kuay ('piece'): *leang-kuay chyan* 'two dollars' (lit. two piece money).

tyau ('line'): *san-tyau shooujin* 'three towels'. Used for oblong objects. Notice, however, that *san-kuay shooujin* means three handkerchiefs. This is one of the rare cases of the numerative modifying the meaning of the following noun. This is to a Chinese not much different from the English use of *straw*, *silk*, *top*, etc. in describing hats. They are all hats just as both handkerchiefs and towels are *shooujin*.

Nouns of measure are used as numeratives just as we say: one pound of tea, a cup of milk, a loaf of bread.

e. Reference.

A general rule is that every reference to the preceding which can be gathered from the context is left unexpressed in Chinese. Personal pronoun objects (especially the neuter), the particles expressing the aspect and tense, all distinctions of sex and number (even the anaphoric personal pronoun *ta* may mean either 'he' or 'she', as in Finnish, and as object it may also mean 'them' in referring to inanimate objects) are generally omitted. Very much is thus left to the hearer's or reader's imagination. The numeratives constitute the most important infraction of this rule not to say any more than is necessary. It is often stated that they were developed to offset the growing confusion resulting from excessive homonymity, which was in turn a consequence of phonetic leveling.

The definite article is found in Chinese, but much less frequently than in Western European languages. It is a weakened demonstrative [nə] from *nah* [╲nα] ('that').

With regard to definiteness and determination the Chinese language is capable of a greater range of definiteness than any

European language. It has the means of being as precise as any of our languages, altho these means are only now beginning to be exploited and it also has the means of throwing off all unnecessary restraints, of speaking generally when this is required. *Man is mortal* in English conveys a false undertone (connotation) of singularity and even of masculinity and adultness. In Chinese all these connotations drop off.

The personal pronouns are *woo* ('I'), *nii* ('you', sg.), *ta* ('he', 'she'), *woomen* ('we'), *niimen* ('you', pl.), *tamen* ('they', m. and f.). *Nin,* a polite equivalent of *nii,* is practically limited to Peiping. A distinction is made in Peiping and a few other places between the two equivalents of 'we'. *Tzarmen* means 'you and I' while *woomen* is used for the 'we' which does not include 'you'. Cf. the French *nous autres.* One of the most common substitutes for *nii* is *shiansheng* ('teacher', 'Mr.'). Cf. Portuguese *o senhor (a senhora)* and Polish *Pan (Pani).* — Formally the personal pronouns in Chinese are treated as nouns.

The demonstratives are *jeh* ('this'), *nah* ('that' and *naa* ('which?'), an interrogative-demonstrative. When used as pronoun-subjects they are generally without numeratives. In the predicate, however, and as demonstrative adjectives they are usually coupled with numeratives. — There are two carefully distinguished degrees of demonstrativeness as in English, and not as in Russian and Polish, where the more distant form is used only where a contrast is expressed or implied, and not as in Spanish and Japanese, and British and American dialects, where three degrees (corresponding to the three persons) find expression.

f. Comparison.

The general rule that everything that can be easily understood from the context or situation fails to find expression in Chinese holds good here. The old ideal of three degrees of comparison is losing (or has lost) ground everywhere. In English we still prescribe the comparative in a few cases where our superlative practice vitiates the rule. In Dutch the superlative is used when two things are compared absolutely. (*Ik ben langer dan U; ik ben het langst.* It is also worthy of note that the article in the predicate is in the neuter irrespective of the gender of the subject. Compare the German equivalent, where d e r and not d a s

would have to be used). In Chinese the following methods are employed:

1. From the context: *Naa i-ge hao ni? Jeh-ge hao.* (Which one is good? = 'Which is better' or 'the best?');

2. By contrast: *Maa dah, liu sheau.* (Horse big, donkey little = 'A / 'The horse is larger than a / the donkey');

3. By means of the verb *bii* ('to compare'): *Nii bii woo dah.* (You compare I / me large = 'You are older than I.');

4. By the addition of *ideal. shiel* ('a little'), *duole* ('by far', 'much'), etc. after an adjective: *sheau ideal* (small a little = 'a little smaller'), *dah duole* (large by much = 'much larger');

5. Absolute superlative (elative): *heen, ding* (Peiping *ting*) ('very'), *genq hao* ('still better').

g. Tense.

The question of tense is closely connected with that of aspect. In English, French, and German grammar the aspects are subordinated to the tenses and the ordinary grammar does not treat aspects as such at all. They are only »different tenses«. In Slavic languages the tenses are in reality subordinated to the aspects. In Chinese the aspects are more important than the tenses, altho European grammarians — influenced no doubt by their own early training — have tried on the whole to work out a tense scheme for Chinese and quite overlooked the aspects. The isolated Chinese verb (like the Chinese noun) is not overloaded with grammatical functions. Even a European infinitive is very far from the colorless state of a Chinese verb in isolation. The English *to come* (as well as German *kommen* and French *venir*) is felt to be a present infinitive, for it stands in contrast with *to have come* and *to be about to come* or (more colloquially) *to be going to come*, which express the past and future infinitive, respectively. Chinese *lai* ('come') is tenseless and aspectless. By dropping the *to* of the infinitive English can make the nearest (tho still very distant) approach to this Chinese state.

The present tense in Chinese is usually the bare form of the verb. The European present often expresses a habit, as: *He eats bread for breakfast.* In Chinese the bare verb form is used

with the addition of an adverb (always, usually, sometimes, etc.) if the sense requires it. Universal truths can thus be expressed in the universal tense in Chinese.

The future tense is also subordinated to aspect and mood. If we conceive of the future act as certain, the neutral (universal) form may be used: *Woo shanq Beeipyng chiuh* 'I am going to Peiping' (I to Peiping go). If the speaker, however, wishes to express an intention or desire, the carrying out of which he does not regard as absolutely certain, he may use *daasuann* ('intend') or *yaw* ('wish'; compare English *will*). In the example given either of the two auxiliaries mentioned would come immediately after the subject *woo*. Another way of expressing the future is the use of *jiow*, one of whose meanings is temporal or causal sequence. If a verb in the first clause expresses an act which is thought of as being completed in the present, the second verb after a word denoting sequence naturally comes to designate the future. Mateer (op. cit., p. 33). *Deeng-i-deeng woo jiow chiuh* (wait one wait I then go = 'Wait a little and I will go').

The past tense is even in Western European languages the one subject to most aspectual differentiation. In Chinese it is purely a matter of aspect. (See the paragraphs on aspect and on negation).

h. Aspect.

If in Slavic languages where the aspects have occupied so much attention no two grammerians have decided upon the same number of aspects and names for them, I shall be excused for having failed to reach the goal in this first attempt to arrange (and that in three pages) the aspects of the Chinese verb in some sort of order.

Before tackling the classification of the aspects a word devoted to the »neuter aspect« would seem in place. It is used in all cases where the context does not require specification. Such a neuter aspect is impossible in the Slavic languages, where a verb must always be perfective or imperfective just as every noun must be in the singular or the plural (or dual), a masculine, feminine, or neuter.

If we take Jespersen's scheme (»The Philosophy of Grammar«, p. 287) and arrange it in the following form we can simplify later references to the various categories:

	a	*b*
1.	Aorist	Imperfect
2.	Conclusive	Non-conclusive
3.	Durative (permanent)	»Punctual« (momentary)
4.	Finished	Unfinished
5.	Unifactual (once, *jednokrotny*)	Frequentative (iterative)
6.	Stability (have, be)	Change: inchoative, inceptive (get, become); cessational (stop)
7.	Implication of result (definite)	Non-implication of result (indefinite).

Let us now take the above categories in order and see how Chinese expresses them:

The aorist may be expressed by *le* immediately after the verb or *jiow* before it and *le* after it. The imperfect (not the Slavic imperfective aspect!) is usually expressed by the neutral form of the verb, altho the addition of *je* may be used on occasion to form this aspect.

The difference between Jespersen's conclusive (terminative, resultative) and non-conclusive (cursive) is of little importance in Chinese. In Western European languages the difference is rarely perceptible except in the past (passive) participle. The non-existence of the passive in Chinese obliterates this distinction.

The durative (permanent) is most often expressed by means of the suffix *-je* (Wade *cho*): *tzuohje* 'to be sitting'; *jannje* 'to be standing'; *hwoje* 'to live', 'to be living' (not in the sense of 'dwell'). *Juh* expresses the same idea plus the nuance of non-change; *tzuohjuh* 'to sit still'. — The opposite idea of a momentary aspect where the action may be conceived of as a point is expressed by the neutral form of the verb or by the addition of *di*, usually with a preceding copula *sh*: *Woo sh leang-deanjong lai di* 'I came at two o'clock' (I am two-o'clock come *di* which interpreted less literally means: 'I am one who came at two o'clock'). Strictly speaking, this is a relative construction without the antecedent *ren*, as was pointed out under Morphology (*di*).

There are several ways of expressing the finishing of an act of which the principal are: (1) verbal *le* plus sentence *le*, (2) *guoh* after the verb (often with *le* added to *guoh*), (3) *wan*

('finish') after the verb, (4) the auxiliaries *lai*, *chiuh* ('come', 'go') usually add a perfective (in the Slavic sense) nuance to the preceding verb. Examples: (1) *Woo chy le fann le* 'I have eaten my meal' (I eat verbal-*le* meal sentence-*le*). This might be called a perfective definite, for it requires the use of *the* or some other defining word in the English translation. (2) *Jeh-ge fann woo chy-guoh* 'I have eaten this dish' (some time or other) (This dish I eat-pass). We have here a perfective indefinite. Some time or other I have eaten this particular dish and hence I know it. If I wish to say that I went to Peiping last year the relative construction given in the preceding paragraph is used. If, however, I only wish to make clear that I have visited that city without specifying when, I must use this *guoh* form. (3) *Woo kann wan le shu, jiow chy-fann* 'When I finish reading this book, I shall eat' (I read finish *le* book, then eat meal). By changing the last verb to read *chy le fann le* the meaning of the sentence is changed thus: 'When I had finished reading the book, I ate (my meal)'. (4) *Ta tzuoh-shiah-chiuh* 'He has sat down'. *Woo jann-chii-lai* 'I have got up'. — The unfinished form is usually expressed by the neutral form, by *-je*, or by *laije*: *Ta shiee tzyh* 'He is writing (words)'. *Ta shieeje tzyh* has the same meaning as the preceding, but is less common. *Woo kee jydaw, tzwol woanshanq shiah yeu laije*: 'I know that it was raining yesterday evening' (I however know yesterday evening fall (down, descend) rain *laije*).

The question of the unifactual aspect is one of the easiest. *Kann* ('to look'); *kann-i-kann* ('to take a look', lit. look one look, where the verb is repeated as a cognate object). This aspect is usually rendered by the verb *take* in English. — *Guoh* (in its most frequent meaning) might also be included here, altho Schmidt (op. cit. p. 304) prefers to call it a past tense and a frequentative. The seeming paradox may be accounted for in this way: In English questions where we use the so-called present perfect tense with *ever*, the Chinese use *guoh*. *Have you ever been in London?* is neither unifactual nor iterative until an adverb of time is added. It is a sort of perfect indefinite. — The past frequentative (iterative) is expressed by *laije* and occasionally by *guoh*: *Woomen tzay Guandong di shyrhowl tiantian daa-wei laije* 'When we were in Manchuria, we used to go hunting every day' (lit. we in Manchuria *di* time every-day go-hunting used-to). (Arendt, »Einfüh-

rung«, p. 255) *Woo shanq jeh-lii lai guoh* 'I used to come here' (lit. I to here come used-to).

The fundamental aspects in Chinese, however, deal with the distinction between stability and a change in state just as in the welter of Slavic aspects we find a thread of »perfective« and »imperfective« going thru the whole system. It is more often required to express change than stability, and in consequence sentence *-le*, the most general particle of change, is very frequent in Chinese. The examples under *le* (at the end of the sentence) (q. v.) will give an idea of this aspect. — *Chiilai* is another means of expressing change. It is limited, however, to the beginning of an action: *na-chiilai* ('pick up'; 'take something into one's hands'), *shiaw chiilai* ('to begin to laugh'). *Shanqlai* expresses a gradual change of state: *hei-shanqlai* 'it is getting darker'. — *Fa* before adjectives corresponds to English 'get': *fa hwang* 'to get yellow'. — If we turn now to the expression of a state we find among others the following means: (1) The neutral form of the verb is used: *Ta ay nah-ge ren:* 'He loves that person'. (2) When a verb may be used both transitively and intransitively, the intransitive form often adds *-je*: *ge* ('to place', 'put'), *geje* ('to be placed', 'se trouver'). (V. the chapter on *je* for additional examples). *Guah* ('to hang' (trans.)), *guahje* ('to hang', 'be hanging' (intr.)) — The addition of *juh* to the verb lends the nuance of stability still greater force: *jann-juh* 'to stay in one place'; *tzuoh-juh* 'to sit still'.

The implication of a result may be expressed by the addition of *guoh, daw*, but the distinction between this and other meanings of the same auxiliaries is so nebulous that it were better to state that no grammatical device is at our disposal for this distinction. This is in harmony with the general rule that words which have only grammatical importance are omitted when the context permits. In German *ersteigen* implies a result while *steigen* does not. In Chinese the object in the first case makes the meaning of the verb quite clear as does the omission of the object in the second.

i. Voice.

The passive voice may be said not to exist in Chinese. There are, however, several means of rendering our passive.

One is to use a verb without a subject. This corresponds to the French *on*, German *man*, Polish *się* ('self') in one of its many uses, and the Russian third person plural without subject. Another means is to have *ren (homo)* or *renren (everybody)* as subject. This is perfectly analogous with the German *man* and French *on*, even as to the etymology. — Since *the watch bought by me* means *the watch which I bought*, the Chinese always express it in this second manner. — When the passive expresses the cause or origin of an action it is usually rendered by *jiaw* in the colloquial style or *bey* in the higher style. In the first case the agent is expressed, in the second it usually is not. *Woo di toei jiaw goou yaw le*: 'My leg was bitten by a dog' (lit. my_2 leg call dog bite *le*, where the word translated 'call' also has the meanings of 'to cause' and 'to permit'). The Chinese do not feel here that there is a passive. The feeling might be better rendered by 'As for my leg, I permitted a dog to bite it'. *Leg* is in the absolute case, the logical subject *I* is omitted as being perfectly clear from the context. The object pronoun *it* is likewise omitted for the same reason.

j. Modality.

The indicative mood is expressed by the absence of any modal forms. *Ta lai* ('he-she is coming').

The infinitive is simply the neutral form *(lai)*, which is often felt to be a verbal noun.

The imperative is either not distinguished from the indicative in the affirmative (even the personal pronoun *you* being preposed as a rule) or the particle *ba* is added at the end of the sentence. This *ba* is not limited to the second person, however. In the other persons it corresponds to the periphrastic imperative of German and English. *Daw le san-deanjong woomen jiow chiuh ba* 'Let's go at three' (lit. reach -ed three o'clock we then go imperative-particle). — The negative imperative has a special negative *(bye)*, which is a corrupted form of *bu yaw* ('not wish', 'not need'). *Bye daa* 'don't beat'. Compare the same sentence in the aspect of change: *Bye daa le* '*Stop beating*' (lit. don't beat begin-to). — Just as in other languages there is a good deal of verbiage, a number of circumlocutions and polite phrases at the

disposal of the Chinese speaker to help him give orders without offending.

The conditional usually omits *if*. If we compare English, German (or Polish), and Chinese, we find that in English *if* is seldom omitted while the introductory word of the second clause (*then*) usually is; in German the introductory words of both clauses are generally expressed, inversion taking the place of *if* when it is dropped; in Chinese the *if* is usually not expressed, while the *then* (Ger. *so*, Polish and Russian *to*) is nearly always present. *Nii mah woo, woo jiow daa-de:* 'if you scold me, I have a right to beat you' (lit. you scold me, I then beat can) (Schmidt, op. cit. p. 405).

The potential mood is highly developed. The auxiliary *neng* expresses physical ability to do something. *Keeyii* denotes that a thing is permitted or suitable or decent. These two precede the verb. (*Der* often follows the principal verb to intensify the potential). *Huey* often translates the English 'to know how', 'to be in the habit of'. — The most frequent method, however, is to insert *der* (unaccented = *de*; *r* is only a sign of the second tone) between the two components of a compound verb to express potentiality and *bu* in the same position to form the negative potential: *na-lai* 'bring', *na-de-lai* 'can bring', *na-bu-lai* 'cannot bring'. — *Bu-chiilai* after the principal verb expresses negative potentiality of the same degree as *bu* above, while *bu-chii* in the same position is much stronger: *chuan-bu-chiilai* 'I cannot put it on' (because of an external obstacle of some kind), *chuan-bu-chii* 'I cannot wear it' = 'I cannot afford to wear it' (an expensive suit, for example, for lack of money).

k. Interrogation.

Interrogation is expressed (1) by special interrogative words: *sheir* 'who?', *sherme* 'what?', 'what kind of?', *tzeeme* 'how?', 'in what manner?' *naa* 'which?', *naal* 'where?', *duotzarn* 'when?', etc.; (2) by interrogative particles: *a, me, ma*; (3) by juxtaposition of two antonyms: *dah sheau?* (lit. large small = 'How large?' or 'Is it large or small?'). We might include in this last group the very frequent repetition of the predicate with *bu* prefixed: *Ta lai bu lai?* (He-she come not come = 'Is he (she) coming?') *Hao bu hao?* (Good not good? = 'Is it all right?'). There is a strong ten-

dency to substitute *meiyeou* for the repeated predicate in the past tense: *Ta lai le meiyeou?* 'Has he come?' instead of the more unwieldy *Ta lai le mei lai?*

The same word order appears in the question as in the answer: *Ta yeou jii-been shu?* ('How many books has he?' Lit. he have how-many-root book? *Root* is the numerative used in counting books).

1. Negation.

The most common negatives in Chinese are *bu* ('not', before the »present« and »future« of verbs, before adjectives, adverbs, etc. *mei* 'not', before the »past« of verbs), *bye*, *bu yaw* used before the imperative. Altho commonly stated that *bu* and *mei* correspond to a difference in tense, an examination will show that here again we are dealing with aspects. *Mei* is used if we think of an event or a change in the past, while *bu* is used of a state or habit. Professor Jaw (Chao), op. cit., p. 112, gives the following excellent illustration: *Tsorngchyan yee bu chou* (lit. formerly also not smoke = 'I did not smoke formerly, either') in answer to *Didn't you use to smoke?* — Or compare *Nii chiuh-nian bu sh shyue Jonggwohuah di ma?* (You last-year not are study Chinese -er eh? = 'Did you not study the Chinese language last year?') with the answer *Woo chiuhnian mei (yeou) shyue, jinnian tsair shyue di* (lit. I last-year not study; this-year *erst* (Ger.) study *di* = 'I did not study it last year; I did not study it until this year'). Compare *Woo mei he char* 'I did not drink any tea' with *Woo bu he le* 'I shan't drink any more'. *Bu* also represents the negative potential mood in certain positions. Cf. the Russian series of negatives in *ne-*: *nečego skazat'*, which means 'I can say nothing' = 'I have nothing to say capable of expressing my surprise (lit. nothing to say).

A question belonging to both affirmation and negation is the difference between English *yes* and *no* (and the corresponding words of most European languages) and Chinese *yes* and *no*. In answer to an affirmative question a Chinese or Japanese (or a Greek) will answer *yes* and *no* together with the Englishman. If the question is in the negative, however, the answers will be different, for a Chinese agrees (or disagrees) with your statement of the case and not with the facts directly: *Nii bu eh a?*

Shyh di, woo shyh bu eh: 'Aren't you hungry?' 'No, I am not hungry' (lit. you not hungry eh? Right$_2$, I truly not hungry).

m, Indirect Discourse.

The rule is to report all speech directly, the only change permissible being a change in pronouns. *He said that he was ill* is rendered: *He said: I am ill* or *He said he is ill.*

2. Some Chinese Syntactical Categories.

a. General.

The selection of categories here is at present a pioneer task, for Chinese grammar has not yet been written from the internal point of view. Then again Chinese categories do not always find expressions in the forms of the language, for the plural, the various aspects, the »tenses«, even the formantia and components of logoid compounds are looked upon as more or less unnecessary evils to be avoided whenever possible. The neutral form of the verb may express all aspects, tenses, moods, and voices (not to mention person and number); the neutral form of the noun may do duty for all numbers, cases, and genders. In addition there is a rule of over two thousand years' standing that any word may be used as a verb. There are few »words« which could not be used as noun logoids. (In Modern Chinese the verb is monosyllabic to a greater extent than the substantive which is fully as often dissyllabic). In IE languages there is also considerable confusion with regard to the various categories distinguished formally (the neuter nominative and accusative are identical while the masculine and feminine of many languages have different forms for the two, etc.), but these irregularities are only surface-manifestations while in Chinese they are at the heart of the grammatical structure. Why say *ten books* when any dunce knows that after *ten* we can only have the plural in mind? Why say »I went there last week« or »I shall go to America next year« when the adverbs of time are clearer than any grammatical form can be? This is the Chinese attitude and altho there are certain signs of change in the direction of a constant use of a form even when the sense would be clear without it, still the person who compared this with the Indo-European attitude to-

wards grammatical categories would be prophesying, not comparing actual facts.

b. Coördination.

The first category is coördination. Coördinating two nouns in our languages is usually expressed by *and*; in Chinese juxtaposition (with retention of the full strength and value of the tones) often serves this purpose. The connectives frequently considered to be equivalents of our *and* almost invariably express a nuance of subordination which escapes the Western European. The Russians with their *My s nim pošli v gorod* (lit. 'we with him went to town' which means only 'He and I went to town') are nearer to the Chinese in this respect. The etymological feel of several of these quasi-equivalents of *and* ('to follow after', 'in harmony with', etc.) is palpable to the native speaker. — Chinese likes short simple sentences and eschews such compound predicates as are common in English: *She skips and jumps* is rendered 'she skips, she jumps'. Here juxtaposition expresses coördination between sentences, for the meaning is: 'She skips and she jumps'. The modern Western Indo-European prefers to omit the second *she*, while the Chinese feels that it is better to omit the *and*. — In English we say *six* or *seven books* while in Russian and Polish as well as in Chinese *six, seven book(s)* suffices. (R. and P. also have the fuller forms and Polish has at least five ways of translating English *or*: lub, albo, czyli, $\theta =$ zero, względnie). — The grammatical coördination of subject and predicate is expressed by juxtaposition: *Ta shuo* 'he speaks', *ta hao* 'he is good'.

There are apparent exceptions to coördination being expressed by mere juxtaposition. The copula before predicate-n o u n s is expressed by *sh* [šř], an ex-demonstrative pronoun. *This is a man* is rendered by *jeh sh ren.* The present subject of the sentence (*jeh*) was doubtless originally felt as an absolute case, much as the French *état* in *l'état c'est moi.* The Chinese *sh* would correspond in every way with the French *ce.* From the historical point of view *sh* is not a copula, just as *to* ('this', 'that') is not considered a copula in Polish, altho it may very often be translated *is* in English. Perhaps *to* is not considered a copula because it is not a verb. (The negation *nie* stands before verbs but after *to* in this pseudo-copula function).

c. Subordination.

The second and most important category of Chinese grammar is that of subordination. The Chinese are the only people who have one form which does duty for almost every kind of subordination, the particle *di*. The author has devoted a great deal of space to *di* because it is the most important word in Chinese and because there seems to have been no attempt up to the present to reduce all the functions of *di* to a common denominator and to name it. It has been called variously a genitive suffix, a relative pronoun, a participial ending, etc., but it is all these and more, for it expresses subordination. (*V. di*).

d. Emphasis.

A third category and one which may be considered the reverse of the preceding is emphasis. If we call this category »superordination« we shall see more clearly the relation between the three. One of the most important devices for adding emphasis is to give the full etymological tone to a word which is normally unaccented. Another method is to insert *sh* or *bu sh* before the word to be emphasized. *Sh* in this case is not emphasized itself and is pronounced in the so-called »light tone«. »When the emphasis is on the occurrence of the event and not on any special aspect of it, then a *shyh* is placed after adverbs of time or place (if any) and before the verb, and is itself emphasized (with the full fourth tone), instead of the word following....... This use of *shyh* is for both affirmative and negative sentences; in the latter case it is placed just before the *bu* or the *meiyeou*, as the case may be«. (The preceding rules and the following illustrations are taken from p. 111 et seq. of Prof. Chao's »Phonograph Course in the Chinese National Language«).

Woo tzwotian daw jie-shanq chiuh mae tsay di 'I went to the streets to buy vegetables yesterday' (lit. I yesterday go-to street to buy vegetables *di*);

Woo bu sh chyantian daw jie-shanq chiuh mae tsay di 'It was not the day before yesterday that I went to the streets to buy vegetables';

Tzwotian sh woo daw jie-shanq chiuh mae tsay di 'It was I who went to the street to buy vegetables yesterday';

Woo tzwotian sh daw jie-shanq chiuh mae tsay di 'It was to the street that I went to buy vegetables yesterday';

Woo tzwotian shyh (fully accented) *daw jie-shanq chiuh mae tsay di* 'I did go to the streets to buy vegetables yesterday';

Woo tzwotian daw jie-shanq bu sh chiuh may tsay di 'It was not to s e l l vegetables that I went to the street yesterday';

Woo tzwotian daw jie-shanq chiuh mae di sh tsay, bu sh you, yan, jianq, tsuh 'What I went to the street to buy yesterday was vegetables, not oil, salt, sauce, or vinegar'.

e. Aspect.

A fourth category is aspect. In this paper I have only been able to scratch the surface of this problem. One thing is quite clear: the Chinese verb can distinguish as many aspects as the Polish or Russian verb and with simpler means. The highly developed system of aspects has retarded the development of independent tenses. There is a perfect (or a past) tense of transitive verbs and there is a sort of future of all verbs formed with auxiliaries which retain more or less of their etymological meaning, but even these two rudimentary tenses drop their auxiliary particles and revert to the universal, neutral form on the slightest provocation. The system of tenses is dependent upon aspects. The two aspects which most often come to expression are (in addition to the neutral aspect) the variable (the aspect of change) expressed most often by *le*, and the stable (the aspect of duration or non-change) formed by the addition of *-je*. These are the two aspects to which all the others are in some way or another subordinated just as in Slavic grammar the imperfective and perfective aspects play a rôle so important that they subordinate not only the tenses but also the other aspects.

V. Lexicon.

A. Word Migration.

There are just five great languages of civilization (Chinese, Sanskrit, Arabic, Greek, Latin) and each of them gave liberally of its word stock to the peoples which came under its cultural sway. In reading a Japanese newspaper to-day one finds that from 20% to 80% of the words are of Chinese origin, or to be

more exact, made up of Chinese elements. (The lower figure refers to the serials and lighter articles while the higher refers to the scientific style and journalese). In modern Chinese there are also great differences in style, but the words are almost without exception made up of native elements. The »loan-words« in Chinese are similar to those of Modern Greek which were coined in Western Europe of Classical Greek elements: they are in large part Japanese compounds of Chinese logoids. There are of course a great number of new Chinese words coined by the Chinese themselves which are in many cases logoid-translations from the leading European languages.

B. Reaction to foreign words.

The reaction to foreign words is different in each and every language. In German there is a strong tendency to replace Greek words by words of native origin. Latin words hold out a little better. French words for a while seemed to be anathema, while English words (especially sporting terms) were welcomed with open arms and untrained tongues. English does not like the translation-into-native-elements idea. We prefer to take the foreign word just as it is (with the necessary phonetic adjustments) *(to telegraph, elevator, automobile)* and then if some good Anglo-Saxon monosyllable presents itself with a semantic burden of five or six meanings we have no hesitation in loading an additional one on it (*to wire, car* for the last two). The Japanese adopt European words fairly easily. The Chinese do not and in all probability never will. In the first place there is a phonetic reason: The lack of consonant groups in Chinese plays havoc with foreign words, where they are so common. Granted even that a Chinese who has learned English can pronounce these groups, there would still be no way of representing them in Chinese script. Since foreign words are most easily spread by the newspapers, the Chinese are thus deprived of their greatest aid in adapting foreign words. (The practice of inserting the English word in parentheses after the new Chinese word is too troublesome to the typesetter and to the reader, who has to turn his book around to read it). Then again the feeling that every syllable should be either a word, a logoid, or a suffix makes longer foreign words more truly foreign to the spirit (i. e. the system) of Chinese than to Japanese. —

In the case of foreign proper names, there is a tendency to write the full name (if it is not already thoroly well known) at the beginning of articles and to use only one syllable (generally the first) in referring to it later. »Professor Kemmerer« becomes »Professor Ke« in the second paragraph! In the case of geographical names, which are often wanted in compounds, the abbreviated form has usually replaced the other.

C. Nominality.

Another characteristic difference between Chinese on one hand and the Western and Central European languages (of IE stock) on the other is the relative percentage of nouns and verbs in a text of a given length. In Chinese the nominal element surpasses by far the verbal element, while in our languages the difference is far less striking. A careful count of several thousand words in four languages gave the following results:

	Nomina	Verba	Others
Chinese	72%	19%	9%
English	49%	16%	35%
Polish	46%	17%	37%
German	47%	20%	33%

Word counts of this kind are uncertain at best, but with all due allowance for differences of opinion and the so-called border-line cases I still believe that the substantial agreement of our languages on the one hand and their disagreement with Chinese is striking enough to warrant noting.

D. Idiomaticalness.

Chinese goes even farther than English in unloading new meanings upon old words. — German and the Slavic languages are easier for the foreigner to learn to read and understand with the aid of the ordinary dictionary, for the proportion of phrases which cannot be understood if one knows the separate words is much lower than in English and Chinese.

E. Assimilation of foreign words.

When the Chinese meet a new idea the following possibilities arise: (1) Adopt the foreign word as it stands in Roman

letters; (2) Use the characters phonetically (generally with complete disregard for their meaning) to render the foreign pronunciation; (3) Translate the foreign word (or word elements) into the equivalent Chinese logoids; (4) Coin a new word which may have no linguistic connection with the original, but only a similar psychological basis. — In Chinese the first stage is either omitted entirely or exists only as a parenthetical explanation of the second stage. I should say offhand that not more than 5 per mille of foreign words are in this stage. The second stage is much more important, but it too is limited in its pristine state to personal and geographical names. People gifted with fantasy have often tried to find suitable phonetic renderings of the foreign words but they have been supplanted for the most part by new words of the third or fourth type. *Telephone*, for example, may be called *derliuhfeng* (virtue — law — wind). Such words are ridiculous at best, altho not quite so ridiculous to the Chinese and Japanese, who delight in word-plays of all kinds, as to us. The very choice of *feng* instead of *fen* shows that the coiner of this word was obsessed with his own cleverness in that he had managed to drag the wind into the compound. With a telephone you can talk thru the wind and the Chinese see no reason why this should not lead to the establishment of virtue and law. In my reading I have run across this word very seldom and never in compounds. The real Chinese and Japanese word for *telephone* belongs to class 4. — The third method is the most common. The Chinese word for *petroleum* is made up of two native elements which mean *stone* and *oil*. There is no compelling psychological reason for such a term. The German *Erdöl* strikes me as being much more natural. The Sino-Japanese word is evidently a translation, a l o g o i d-translation from English. — The fourth method is also very common. This is especially resorted to when the connotation of the Chinese logoids diverges too far from the European logoids or when the Chinese feel that the European logoids were not well chosen. *Telephone* is an example in point. »Far off — sound« is not so good as the Chinese »electric talk«. *Stethoscope* would suggest an instrument for l o o k i n g into the chest, while the Chinese equivalents mean 'listen — examine — instrument' and 'listen — chest — instrument', respectively.

VI. Writing.

A. Classes of characters.

The Chinese characters of to-day are usually divided into six classes:

Symbolic characters: *One* is written as one horizontal stroke; *three* as three such strokes, *middle* is a rectangle with a vertical line thru the center, and projecting above and below.

Picturographs: The original character for '*sun*' was a circle with a dot in it. The introduction of the writing brush eliminated circles, so that the present form of this character is an upright rectangle with a horizontal line thru the center. The character for *moon* was a crescent, which was later subject to modification in the same sense as '*sun*'.

Phonograms: This is the largest class and comprises easily five-sixths of the characters in use to-day. With the development of this principle the Chinese secured a system which incorporated many of the advantages of phonetic writing into the existing system. The Chinese language was peculiarly adapted to this form of writing because of the limited number of sound-complexes (the same phonetic syllables without reference to the tones) and the monosyllabic nature. For example, a certain common character is pronounced *fang* 'square'. If we add the radical 'earth' at the left we get a word meaning 'street', if we add 'door', we secure a word meaning 'building' which is pronounced *farng* (*r* in postvocalic position in the Gwoyeu spelling is a sign of the second tone and does not alter the sound content of the syllable in any respect). If we add 'raw silk' we obtain *faang*, which means 'to spin'. With 'grass' at the top, 'fragrant plants'; with 'words' at the left, 'to inquire, search'. With 'woman' at the left, 'to impede', which would seem to indicate that woman was regarded as a *malum necessarium*. With a 'step' at the left, 'to resemble', for one step resembles another. — There are a great number of semiphonetic elements also which give only the »final« (or rime) of the syllable while the initials vary. There also exist obsolete phonetics which are now non-phonetic.

Ideographs: The two characters for *sun* and *moon* are made about half their normal width, put together and the resulting character means 'bright', the common quality or property of the

sun and moon. Two 'trees' side by side constitute the character for 'forest'. A tree with the sun shining thru, 'east'. A 'roof' with a 'pig' under it 'home'.

Analogical characters: These are characters which have changed the position of two or more of the component parts or added a stroke or dropped one for a new meaning: 'tree' plus 'eye' in one character means 'mutual' while 'eye' plus 'tree' means 'dark'.

»Borrowed« characters: When the character which means 'heaven', 'sky' is extended to mean 'day', 'root' to mean 'beginning', we are dealing with borrowed characters. (This term is taken from the Chinese).

B. Creation of characters.

The question may arise: When and under what circumstances do the Chinese create new characters? They create them (1) for onomatopoetic words (usually the radical 'mouth' plus a well-known character which represents the sound in question); (2) for particles (also made up of 'mouth' plus a common character of the same pronunciation as the particle); (3) for foreign words. The English measures of length) for example, are represented as follows: *inch*, *foot*, and *mile* are written with characters made up of 'mouth' and the nearest Chinese measure. The nautical mile very appropriately has 'water' at the left instead of 'mouth'. — The metric system (recently officially adopted) comes in for double treatment. The official names are dissyllabic compounds, the first component of which is 'public, official' while the second is the corresponding Chinese measure. No new characters are thus required. There is a second means of writing the metric units, a detailed explanation of which follows. The initial syllable of the unit of length (*meter*) is taken in its English form and assigned a character *mii* ('rice'). This *mii* is taken as a radical and the basic unit of length of the Chinese system (*chyy* — 'foot') is added at the right. In this case, the analysis of the character is complicated, for the radical is at the same time the phonetic, while the clue to the meaning is given not by the radical as is usual, but by the Chinese measure! A *Dekameter* is written 'rice' at the left and 'ten' at the right. *Hectometer* is made up of 'rice' + 'hundred', and so on up to *myriameter* (10.000 in Chinese is rep-

resented by a simple word and a single character). The decimals are expressed correspondingly: *decimeter* is 'rice' + the character for 'one-tenth', etc. — The same rules apply to the measures of capacity and weight, except that for capacity the character 'stand' (*lih*) is used instead of *mii* and for weight *keh*, which means 'to be equal to' or 'to subdue'.

C. Present Prospects.

A sketch, however brief, of Chinese writing is not complete without a few words as to the present reforms in Chinese writing and the possibilities of future developments. The past twenty years, and especially the last ten, have witnessed many attacks upon the age-old wall of Chinese characters, the wall which preserved Chinese unity when walls of stone were scaled by the barbarians. In Europe, too, the question is often asked me: Why don't the Chinese scrap their system and adopt something more sensible or at least more simple? In this century when the Albanians have laicized their alphabet by giving up three alphabets in favor of a new uniform Latin alphabet and the Ottoman Turks have broken with all their writing traditions for the sake of internationalization, why should the Chinese and Japanese stick to their characters?

Everyone except the dyed-in-the-wool conservatives realizes that some reform is inevitable if the nation is to be preserved. Some feel that with the simplification of the written language brought about by the Bairhuah (Paihua) Movement the question is already settled, that a reform of the system of writing itself is unnecessary. This movement brought the language down from classical heights to the understanding of the masses, and what is more, it gave them the tangible hope that they might with a moderate expenditure of time and money hope to express and assert themselves in this new language.

It is one thing to write in the language of the people and quite another to be sure that the people can read what is written. As to the reform of the written symbols themselves great differences of opinion exist. Some favor limiting the characters to some definite number, especially in popular works. The Thousand-Character Movement for adult education is the best known

step in this direction [1]. In a recent edition of the Thousand-Character textbooks there appeared 1300 characters!

Others favor retaining the characters as at present with the new phonetic letters added at the right of the characters for the less educated. This is simply an adaptation of the Japanese *hurigana* (*f*...) idea. In Japanese this system is more useful than it would be in Chinese, for the character which is always read *sheng* in the same dialect of Chinese has no fewer than 21 different readings in Japanese. The Japanese reader is thus in much greater need of the *kana*-crutch than the Chinese.

Others still more radically inclined propose scrapping the characters and writing in the phonetic alphabet. The great difficulty here, however, is that a text written phonetically cannot be understood by a Chinese who happens to speak a dialect very different from that which gave rise to the National Language. Even a Mandarin reader who has a great number of local pronunciations has to stop to think every now and then. This phonetic writing presupposes a knowledge of the new national pronunciation. A unified school system can in one generation bring about this state, but at present the characters are what they have been for millennia: the greatest single bond of Chinese unity. If the process of the unification of pronunciation should prove too slow (for reformers are always in a hurry), the phonetic alphabet might be adopted outright and then those who had not gone to the trouble to make a personal sacrifice for China's linguistic unity would have nothing new to read. There would have to be a few hundred beheadings to put such a drastic reform thru at present, and furthermore it remains to be seen whether China has a Kemal Pasha or not.

The last reform project is the adoption of the Roman alphabet. I favor this last solution of the question in Japan as I did in Turkey, for the Chinese and Arabic systems of writing are peculiarly unadapted to the requirements of Japanese and

[1] In Japan the Ministry of Education Committee selected a list of 1962 characters and recommended that no others be used in works for the broader public. The newspapers reduced from 6000 to 2500 and said they had done their best. The Japanese have two native alphabets, however, in which they can write a word or the missing part of a word and this possibility the Chinese did not possess until recently.

Turkish. The question is quite different, however, if Chinese and Arabic wish to Romanize. Romanization in these two languages would bring either greater real unity of the educated classes or a breaking-up of what is relatively uniform into smaller literary languages. And no one can prophesy with any degree of certainty that Romanization would lead to a higher and newer unity. It is at least equally possible that some literary genius should be born in Canton and that he would write in his mother-tongue and be unintelligible to those who read only the »national language«. If a European ethnic group numbering 120,000 has managed to develop two »literary languages«, surely the Cantonese (linguistically speaking) with their 20,000,000 should have a 'right' to a separate literary language. The real measure of culture is paradoxically enough the number of rights which are in the interest of something higher n o t exercised. Culturally Europe is lower to-day because everybody is bent upon taking advantage of every right he has been able to frighten out of his government. If Romanization comes in Chinese let us hope that regional words and expressions and regional pronunciations will be used for the enrichment of one of the richest languages on earth and not for its break-up. If English, spoken in two of the strongest international powers of the world, cannot afford the split into British and American, surely Chinese will follow this example of wisdom and self-restraint, which is more honorable and more profitable than all gilded-twopenny rights.

In conclusion I wish to express my thanks to Professor Jan Rozwadowski for his initiative in connection with the present paper and for his ever-friendly advice given during its writing and to Professor Kazimierz Nitsch for many helpful suggestions, especially in connection with the plan. I am under obligation to the editors for their forbearance in spite of the great delay in the preparation of this manuscript.

Cracow, Poland, October 1931.

Denzel Carr.

Bibliography.

Works cited:

1) Arendt, Carl: *Handbuch der nordchinesischen Umgangssprache I*, 1891, *Einführung in die nordchinesische Umgangssprache*. 1894 (*Lehrbücher des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen zu Berlin, Bände 7 und 12*);

2) Blakney, Raymond B.: *A Course in the Analysis of Chinese Characters*. Commercial Press, Shanghai 1926;

3) Chao, Yuen Ren (Jaw Yuanrenn): *A Phonograph Course in the Chinese National Language*. Com. Press, Shanghai 1925;

4) Karlgren, B.: *Sound and Symbol in Chinese*. Oxford University Press, London 1923;

5) Mateer, C. W.: *A Course of Mandarin Lessons*. Rev. Ed., Presbyterian Mission Press, Shanghai 1903;

6) Schmidt, Pierre: *Essai de Grammaire Mandarine (en russe)*, of which the Russian title is: Опытъ мандаринской грамматики. II. изд., Восточный Институтъ, Владивостокъ. 1913.

Works frequently consulted:

1) von der Gabelentz, Georg: *Anfangsgründe der chinesischen Grammatik*. T. O. Weigel, Leipzig 1883;

2) Guernier, R. Ch.: *Notes sur la prononciation de la langue mandarine de Pékin*. Association Phonétique Inter., Teubner 1912;

3) Jaw, Yuanrenn: *Tzueyhow wuu-fen jong*, Jonghwa Shujyu, Shanghai 1929;

4) Li, Chin-Hsi: *Chinese Phonetic System and Language*, Com. Press, 1921; *Model Chinese Readers in Romanized Phonetic Transcription*. Jonghwa Shujyu, 1928;

5) Liu, Fu: *Les Mouvements de la Langue Nationale en Chine*. Université Nationale, Pékin 1925;

6) Okamoto, M.: *Sinago Kyookwasyo* [A Chinese textbook for Japanese]. Tôkyô 1924.

7) Усов и Чжэн Ай-Тан: Учебник китайского разговорного языка, VI. Изд., Чурин, Харбин, 1930

Note. — The author greatly regrets that he did not have access to all the works of Professor Karlgren in the writing of this paper. — The published, and still more important the unpublished works of Prof. H. E. Palmer and Nikolaï V. Yushmanov in the form of personal letters have been of inestimable value in the linguistic preparation for this paper, altho neither of them is directly connected with the subject of the present article.

Appendix.

The Gwoyeu Spelling used in these pages has an unfamiliar look to Sinologists and may require some justification or at least an explanation.

The initials are given on page 54 and are subject to only one alteration. Since the first tone is practically non-existent after the liquids (l, r, m, n) it has been found more expedient to let the unaltered final (V. *infra*) represent the second tone after these four letters and to represent the first tone by the addition of *h*: lha, mhau, nhian, rhang.

The 'letters' *j*, *ch*, *sh* have a double value: Before palatalizing vowels they represent ć, ć', ś (with many dialectal variants), before other vowels they represent č, č', ṣ̌. In isolation these latter values may be expressed by the addition of *r*: jr, chr, shr.

The fundamental innovation of the Gwoyeu system is the representation of the tone by an alteration in the spelling of the syllable (usually in the medial or final) itself and not by the addition of tone-marks before the syllable or numbers after it.

The finals are written in the four tones as given below. For the phonetic values compare the corresponding letters in the first (first-tone) column with the description of them given on page 55.

Finals (including 'medials' in final position).

First tone	Second tone	Third tone	Fourth tone
y	yr	yy	yh
i	yi	yii, -ii	yih, -ih
u	wu	wuu, -uu	wuh, -uh
iu	yu	yeu, -eu	yuh, -iuh
a	ar	aa	ah
o	or	oo	oh
e	er	ee	eh
ai	air	ae	ay
ei	eir	eei	ey
au	aur	ao	aw
ou	our	oou	ow
an	arn	aan	ann
en	ern	een	enn
ang	arng	aang	anq
eng	erng	eeng	enq
el	erl	eel	ell

Medials + Finals.

ia	ya	yea, -ea	yah, -iah
io*	yo*	yeo*	yoh*

First tone	Second tone	Third tone	Fourth tone
ie	ye	yee, -iee	yeh, -ieh
iai*	yai	yeai*	yay*
iau	yau	yeau, -eau	yaw, -iaw
iou	you	yeou, -eou	yow, -iow
ian	yan	yean, -ean	yann, -iann
in (⇐ [i + ən])	yn	yiin, -iin	yinn, -inn
iang	yang	yeang, -eang	yanq, -ianq
ing (⇐ [i + əng])	yng	yiing, -iing	yinq, -inq
ua	wa	woa, -oa	wah, -uah
uo	wo	woo, -uoo	woh, -uoh
uai	wai	woai, -oai	way, -uay
uei	wei	woei, -oei	wey, -uey
uan	wan	woan, -oan	wann, -uann
uen	wen	woen, -oen	wenn, -uenn
uang	wang	woang, -oang	wanq, -uanq
ueng, -ong	weng*, -orng	woeng, -oong	wenq, -onq
iue	yue	yeue*, -eue	yueh, -iueh
iuan	yuan	yeuan, -euan	yuann, -iuann
iun (⇐ [ü + ən])	yun	yeun, -eun*	yunn, -iunn
iong (⇐ [ü + əɒ])	yong	yeong, -eong	yonq, -ionq

Supplement.

For sounds not recognized by Gwoyeu II but which are found in the various dialects, the Gwoyeu spelling has made ample provision.

1) The fifth tone of the Nanking dialect is represented by final *q*. There is no possible chance of confusion with the *q* of the fourth tone, for the latter is always preceded by *n*. This Nankingese *q* represents the glottal stop: *tieq*, *loq* (*tiee*, *luoh* in the National Pronunciation).

2) The fully voiced initials of the Shanghai dialect are represented by *bh*, *dh*, *gh*, *dj*, *dz*: *bhu*, *dji*, *dzy* (*pwu*, *chyi*, *tsyr* in the N. P.).

3) The Cantonese finals *m*, *p*, *t*, *k* (the last three implosive) are represented by these letters: *sam*, *lap*, *tzit*, *hork* (*san*, *lih*, *jye*, *shyue* in the N. P.).

Sprawy Towarzystwa.

I

Sprawozdanie z IV i V Walnego Zebrania członków P. T. J. połączonych ze zjazdami językoznawczemi.

Czwarty Zjazd językoznawczy w Krakowie 8 czerwca 1930 r.

Prezes K. Nitsch poświęcił wspomnienie pośmiertne zmarłym członkom Towarzystwa: Janowi Łosiowi, Wiktorowi Porzezińskiemu, Janowi Baudouinowi de Courtenay i Karolowi Appelowi.

Referaty naukowe.

1. W. Doroszewski (Warszawa): **Do źródeł doktryny de Saussure'a (filozofja Durkheima)**. Referat w całości ogłoszony drukiem p. t. »Socjologja i filozofja Durkheima« w »Przeglądzie Filozoficznym« XXXIII (1930) 181—95.

2. J. Kuryłowicz (Lwów): **Teorja powstania bałtycko-słowiańskich różnic intonacyjnych**. Referat ogłoszony drukiem w znacznie rozszerzonej postaci p. t. »Le problème des intonations balto-slaves« w »Roczniku Slawistycznym« X (1931) 1—80.

3. St. Pfanhauserowa (Warszawa): **Słowotwórstwo i etymologja mowy dziecinnej**. Referat ogłoszony drukiem w postaci rozszerzonej p. t. »Rozwój mowy dziecka« w »Pracach Filologicznych« XV (1930) 273—356.

4. W. Taszycki (Lwów): **O przyszłym słowniku imion staropolskich**. Referat ogłoszony w całości w »Języku Polskim« XV (1930) 97—102.

Wszystkie referaty wywołały ożywione dyskusje, w których brali udział T. Kowalski, T. Lehr-Spławiński, K. Nitsch, J. Rozwadowski, M. Rudnicki, S. Szober, H. Willman-Grabowska i prelegenci.

Sprawozdanie kasowe przyjęto. W miejsce ustępujących w myśl statutu członków Zarządu A. Kleczkowskiego, T. Kowalskiego i M. Rudnickiego wybrano E. Klicha (Poznań), H. Oesterreichera (Kraków) i J. Otrębskiego (Wilno). Tak uzupełniony Zarząd na posiedzeniu dn. 8. czerwca 1930 wybrał przezesem Towarzystwa J. Rozwadowskiego (Kraków), wiceprezesem S. Szobera (Warszawa), sekretarzem (ponownie) T. Lehr-Spławińskiego (Kraków), skarbnikiem H. Oesterreichera (Kraków).

Piąty Zjazd językoznawczy w Warszawie 23 i 24 maja 1931.

Referaty i dyskusje naukowe.

1. K. Gołębiewski (Toruń): **Z psychologji mowy u św. Augustyna.** Por. wyżej str. 3—37.

Dyskusja:

Rozwadowski: Bardzo ciekawy odczyt ks. Gołębiewskiego pokazał zadziwiającą jasność myśli św. Augustyna w uchwyceniu znakowości języka w dokładnem rozróżnieniu *signum* i *res signata,* w podkreśleniu pierwszorzędnej roli czynnika nastrojowego i emocjonalnego i t. d. Wypada stwierdzić z melancholją, że inicjatywa św. Augustyna, która była niby świeżym prądem jasnej myśli po ciasnem nastawieniu całej starożytności w sprawach językowych, niestety nie znalazła następnie kontynuacji. Językoznastwo poczęści dopiero z początkiem XX wieku wstąpiło niezależnie na drogę pokrewną, toteż głos św Augustyna brzmi dzisiaj doprawdy jak rewelacyjna niespodzianka.

Zabierali też głos: Kleczkowski, Kuryłowicz, Doroszewski, Willman-Grabowska, Szober i Nitsch.

2. A. Kleczkowski (Poznań): ***Gamrat* a *gach.***

Forma *gamrat* z formami pochodnemi *gamratka, gamracki, gamracja* występuje w polskiem od XV wieku. [Brückner: Kazania średniowieczne, Glosy polskie, Pamiętniki Janczara 1496—1500, Erzepki 1532, Mymer 1532, Rej: Figliki 1562, Zwierciadło 1568, St. Koszutski, Mączyński 1564, Ezop 1578, Kochanowski, Zygrovius 1611, Knapski 1621, Potocki: Moralia 1688].

Starsza jest forma łac. *gameratus.*

Frowin, zapewne z Sącza, kanonik sandomierski i krakowski, napisał w pierwszej połowie XIV w. utwór, uczący morałów i gramatyki zarazem, p. t. Antigameratus przeciw dawniejszemu Gameratus jakiegoś Teodoryka.

Dotychczas wyprowadzano polskie formy z łac. *gameratus, cameratus*, a to z *camera, camero*; tak Linde, Karłowicz, przeciw czemu już dawno podnosił wątpliwości Brückner. Toteż kiedy Štrekelj podał etymologję z niemieckiego karyntyjskiego *gâmer* 'pochuć', *gâmerig* 'begierig', Brückner przyjął to, i etymologja ta panowała do dnia dzisiejszego. Formalnie możnaby przyjąć obie te etymologje, ale trudności powstają, jeśli zwrócimy uwagę na podobne imiona własne i nazwy geograficzne we Francji, Niemczech, w Czechach i w Polsce.

Autor wychodzi od bohatera epopei dworskiej, od *Gamureta* d'Anjou, ojca Parsivala i Feirefiza, przyjmując możliwość skrzyżowania z łac. *cameratus, gameratus*, czy też nawet niem. *gâmer*.

Gamuret, *Gamret* Francja, *Gammert*, *Gamart*, *Gamarit* Niemcy Förstemann (cf. *Gamerthe, Gemert* nazwy geograficzne Brabancja Förstemann), *Gamaret* Styrja 1436, *Gamrit*, *Kahmoret* Bawarja, *Gamaryth* Praga 1590, *Gamaryth*: *Kamaryt* z Rovin Praga 1563, *Gameroth* Śląsk 1411, Franciszek *Gamrat* Kraków 1325, Zawisza *Gamrat* v. *Gamerat* 1352 Boniecki, Niesiecki, Czarniecki.

We Francji, Anglji, Włoszech, Hiszpanji, Skandynawji, Holandji, Niemczech... imiona poezji ludowej czy dworskiej żyją długo lub do dziś dnia jako imiona własne, nazwiska czy nazwy geograficzne. W Polsce mamy *Wietrzycha* Obrzymskiego (*Dietrich* von Bern), potem z tego *wytrych*, *Rydygiera*, *Zebrzyda*, *Walcerza* Udałego (*Walther* von Aquitanien), *Wolbroma* i *Olbroma* (*Wolfram*), *Jaktora* (*Hektor*); może *Awdaniec* to *Abdanz*, dziadek Gamureta.

Przejście byłoby takie jak *frant* z cz. *Frant*, *Franta*, łac. *Franciscus*..., *Antek* z *Antoni*, *andrus* z *Andrzej*.

Z epopei francuskiej przez Niemcy, Czechy i Śląsk dostał się *Gamuret, Gamerat, Gamrat* do Polski, z 'bohatera' nabrał znaczenia 'błazna', 'kochanka', 'wszetecznika'.

Może już w poezji były podstawy do pierwszego przejścia znaczenia, t. j. 'kochanka'. *Gamuret* walczy na dalekim Wschodzie w Zazamanc o rękę pięknej królowej murzyńskiej Belkane, zdobywa ją i wnet, szukając nowych przygód, opuszcza królową,

która ma zostać matką. Zwycięża w turnieju o rękę królowej Herzeloyde z Waleis, ale znowu opuszcza drugą małżonkę i walcząc dla kalifa bagdadzkiego, ginie na polu chwały. Z tego niestałego kochanka mogło się w imieniu zachować wspomnienie. Zresztą poezja i podanie zmienia często do niepoznania dawne wątki, z bohaterów robi tchórzy, z wiernych żon niewierne. Z imienia zostaje tylko dźwięk pusty, który przez nowe związki językowe, etymologję ludową nabiera nowej treści w kierunku dodatnim, a przeważnie ujemnym.

Tak *Gamrat von Gamerat* i *gamrat* to z jednej strony echo rycerskiej poezji francuskiej i niemieckiej w Polsce, a z drugiej strony może poezji moralizującej Teodoryka i Frowina. Może porównanie tych dwu autorów i ich wierszy lepiej w przyszłości tę rzecz oświetli.

Polskie *gach* występuje w dwa wieki po *gamracie*, bo dopiero w XVII w. (Poselstwo z Dzikich Pól od Sowizdrzała z r. 1606, Synod ministrów heretyckich 1611, Zygrovius Papopompe 1611, Knapski 1621, Potocki, Monitor, Teatr polski). Linde i Karłowicz wyprowadzają go z niem. *Gauch* 'kochanek', Karłowicz także z *Galan*, choć to z pewnością późniejsze. Brückner PF, Słownik etymologiczny, a za nim Berneker, Rozwadowski i inni uważają *gacha* za skrót z *gamrata*.

Gach należy również do literatury niemieckiej, i to nie do literatury przyrodniczej, n. *Gauch* 'kukułka', lecz już do literatury błazeńskiej (Narrenliteratur), bo w polskiem nie występuje nigdy w znaczeniu pierwotnem 'kukułki', lecz przenośnem 'kochanka, rozpustnika, cudzołożnika'. Kukułka składa jaja swe w obce gniazdo, stąd przenośnia zrozumiała, nadto występuje w różnych językach w znaczeniu głupca, może dlatego, że powtarza do znużenia swoje nazwisko. Niemiecka literatura błazeńska chłosta pod maską głupstwa, błazeństwa różne słabości życia prywatnego i publicznego, a za Starym Testamentem używa pojęcia głupca na niemoralnego. Tak pojęcie *Gauch* 'kukułki' przechodzi w znaczenie 'cudzołożnika', 'rozpustnika, głupca'. Z dziesiątek utworów, facecyj, fraszek klasycznem dziełem tego kierunku literatury błazeńskiej jest Murnera Gauchmatt, pomijając Laus stultitiae Erazma czy Narrenschiff Branta...

Z literatury rycerskiej i mieszczańskiej: moralizującej, sowizdrzalskiej, błazeńskiej przeszły te wyrazy do języka gospo-

darskiego i myśliwskiego: *gamrat* 'pies płodzący', 'kiernoz gamratliwy', 'samiec dzik', *gach* 'zając samiec'.

3. M. Rudnicki (Poznań): **O pierwotnych indoeuropejskich mieszkańcach dorzecza Wisły i Odry.**

Środki, wiodące do ustalenia charakteru tych mieszkańców, opierają się na badaniach: 1. archeologicznych, 2. etnicznych, 3. językowych.

Zdaniem prelegenta dane archeologiczne mogą spełniać rolę tylko i jedynie pomocniczą, ponieważ w zasadzie dotyczą one rozszerzeń względnie zaników kultury materjalnej, której bezwarunkowo nie można identyfikować z pojawianiem się względnie ustępowaniem określonych ludów. Dane etniczne byłyby znacznie dogodniejszym środkiem. Atoli etniczne materjały przedhistoryczne są nader słabe, a w części swej względnie pewnej wchodzą w zakres kultury materjalnej. Dzisiejszy zaś stan porównawczej etnologji i etnografji nie pozwala wysnuwać pewnych wniosków z przerzutami w daleką przeszłość. Wobec tego pozostaje materjał językowy i jego analiza jako jedynie pewny materjał, pozwalający wysnuwać wnioski o zasiedleniu określonych terenów w dalekiej przeszłości.

Materjał ten musi mieć charakter terenowy, t. zn. onomastyczny, w przypuszczeniu, że w nazwach miejscowych kryją się elementy językowe, właściwe tym ludom, które dane tereny dłużej zajmowały. O ile chodzi o dorzecza Wisły i Odry, to z materjału onomastycznego należy wyciągnąć wnioski w formie odpowiedzi na pytania: 1. Czy są w nim elementy przedindoeuropejskie? 2. Czy wśród indoeuropejskich nazw są takie, które mają podwójny, względnie potrójny charakter językowy, czy też tylko i wyłącznie jednolity?

Co się tyczy pierwszego pytania, to należy odpowiedzieć potakująco, t. zn., że wśród onomastyki dorzeczy Wisły i Odry występują nazwy nieindoeuropejskie, zapewne przedindoeuropejskie, np *Verissa* (XIII w.) = dziś pol. *Wierzyca*, por. też J. Rozwadowski RS IV 48, o innych wątpliwych por. M. Rudnicki SO IX 566 i nn.

Drugie pytanie również pozytywnie da się rozwiązać. Mianowicie w niektórych okolicach dorzecza Wisły i Odry dadzą się stwierdzić procesy głosowe, właściwe językom germańskim. Zu-

pełnie pewne przykłady stanowią *Skrwa*, l. i p. dopływ Wisły, w XIII w. *Strkwa* ⇐ germ. **Strukō* (J. Rozwadowski RS VI 54). Postać **Strukō* może być nazwą germańską, por. norweską nazwę rzeczną *Struka* albo też jest to zgermanizowana nazwa słowiańska, przejęta przed albo w okresie trwania t. zw. »erste urgermanische Lautverschiebung«, albo też nawet później drogą substytucji fonetycznej, t. zn. z pralech. **Strugā*, a zatem po przejściu *ou* ⇒ *u*. Krótkość germ. *-u-*, które dało późniejsze słow. *-ъ-* w *Strkwa* ⇐ **Strъky*, przemawia za bezpośrednią germańskością nazwy *Strkwa*. Drugą nazwą jest *Pełta*, w XIII w. *Pełtew*, p. d. Narwi pod Pułtuskiem, reprezentująca germ. **fulpō*. Te nazwy germańskie są może osadem pozostałym po inwazji gockiej.

Główny trzon nazw rzecznych i wogóle wodnych w dorzeczu Wisły i Odry zdaje się wykazywać jednolitość językową, t. zn. w swym rozwoju fonetycznym nazwy te są zupełnie regularne, czyli w swych przemianach głosowych nie zawierają żadnych szczegółów, wskazujących na interwencję obcą pozaindoeuropejską lub heterogeniczną indoeuropejską. Znaczy to, że od początków indoeuropejskich, które zazwyczaj datujemy w zagłębiu Bałtyku na okres neolitu ± 5000 lat przed Chrystusem, aż po dziś dzień, t. zn. po okres nowopolski najświeższej daty, nazwy te zmieniały się fonetycznie naprzód według zasad indoeuropejskich, później wschodnioindoeuropejskich, następnie przedsłowiańskich, prasłowiańskich, słowiańskich, zachodniosłowiańskich, pralechickich, lechickich, prapolskich i polskich wreszcie. Jest to zupełnie pewnym dowodem, że od ± 5000 lat przed Chr. w dorzeczu Wisły i Odry, gdzie te nazwy występują, ludność w zasadzie była ta sama, t. zn. mówiła tym samym językiem, który powoli i na miejscu zmienił się stopniowo z dialektu (czy też dialektów) indoeuropejskich na dzisiejszy język polski w nieprzerwanej kontynuacji. Metodycznie rzecz biorąc, pewność wniosku o nieprzerwaności omawianych nazw wodnych jest taka sama, jak i hipoteza, że polszczyzna jest dalszym nieprzerwanym ciągiem określonej grupy językowej indoeuropejskiej.

Nazwy te dadzą się wywieść z pierwiastka indoeurop. **su̯ei̯d-* || **u̯ei̯d-* we wszystkich jego odmianach, oznaczającego 'wilgoć'. Dla jego oczywistości wystarczy wskazać na łac: *sūdor* ⇐ **su̯oid-ōs*, germ. **swaita-* i t. d., por. SO VIII 392 nn.

Występuje on naprzód w polszczyźnie jako appellativum

widne (pole) 'wilgotne', *świdne (żyto)* 'niedojrzałe, wilgotne'; następnie w szeregu nazw wodnych z sufiksami staremi i zupełnie nowemi w całem dorzeczu Wisły od źródeł aż po ujście, jak również i w całem dorzeczu Odry, oznaczając przy źródłach Wisły oraz na przestrzeni pomiędzy Wisłą dolną i Odrą jako appellativum 'rzekę, ruczaj, potok' w ogólności: por. góral., pińcz. *wisła* || słowiń. ˡ*vjislə*.

Nazwy dotyczące: *Wda*, * *Wida* (= zniemcz. *Weide*) ⇐ * *Vьdā*, * *Veidā*, dopływy dolnej Wisły i średniej Odry; *Zawidza* ⇐ * *Za-veid-i̯ā*, staw; *Przy-, O-, Po-, Za- widz* ⇐ * *Prei-* * *O-* * *Po-* * *Za-veid-i̯o-s*, jeziora; *Wisła, Wisłoka, Wisłok, Wiślica, Świslina* ⇐ * *Veid-* + *tlā*, * *Veid-tl-ok-ā*, * *Veid-tl-ok-o-s*, * *Veid-tl-ica*, * *Sveid-tl-ina*, Wisła i jej dopływy oraz miasto leżące nad Wisłą; * *Wstra, Wistrzyca* (= zniemcz. *Striessbach, Weistritz*) ⇐ * *Vьd- tra*, * *Veid- tr- ica*, dopływy Wisły i Odry; *Świder, Viadrus* ⇐ * *Sveid- ro- s*, * *Voi̯d-ro- s*, dopływ Wisły, stara nazwa Odry; *Widava, Widawka* ⇐ * *Veid-a-va*, * *Veid-av-ъka*, dopływy Warty i Odry; *Wid-ok* ⇐ * *Veid-ok-o-s*, staw; *Widlino, Gowidlino* ⇐ * *Veid-ъl-ino*, wsie; *Świdnik, Świdnica* (= zniemcz. *Schweidwitz*) ⇐ * *Sveid-ьn-iko-s*, * *Sveid-ьn-ika*, liczne potoki i dopływ Odry; *Vidi-varii*, nazwa ludu nad dolną Wisłą u Jordanesa (VI w.); *Viduchova* (XIII. w.) nad Odrą dolną zniemcz. *Fiddichow* ⇐ * *Veid-ouch-ov-ā*; *Ουίαδουα* ⇐ * *Ved-ov-ā* ⇐ * *Void-ov-ā* (u Ptolomeusza), nazwa zapewne Odry średniej albo Widawy; *Wdzice, Wdzidze* ⇐ * *Vьd-ęt-i̯o-*, * *Vьd-id-ьje*, jezioro i t. d. Dokładniejsze omówienie każdej formy czytelnik znajdzie w SO III/IV—IX, kierując się według indeksów leksykograficznych, dołączonych do poszczególnych tomów.

Że ludność, która nazwy powyższe stworzyła, stykała się od najdawniejszych czasów z ludami w okolicach tych zasiedziałemi, świadczą nazwy, nadawane tej ludności przez jej germańskich sąsiadów. Nazwy te są sufiksalnie słowiańskie, lechickie, polskie, aczkolwiek pierwiastek może być pochodzenia pozaindoeuropejskiego, bo podobne nazwy spotykają się też u innych Indoeuropejczyków, a także u Ilirów i Etrusków nieindoeuropejskich. Co ciekawsze: najstarsza nazwa * *Ven-t-*, zachowana w nordyjskiem spółgłoskowem pluralis *vinþr* ⇐ lech. * *Ven-t-es*, jest pokrewna sufiksalnie formacjom etnicznym etruskim *Nar-t-es* 'mieszkańcy nad rzeką *Nar*': *Nar* 'rzeka Nar'. Inne nazwy lechickie od tegoż pierwiastka * *Ven-*, a przejęte przez German i stosownie

fonetycznie zmienione, są: * *Ven-et-ъ*, * *Ven-ot-ъ*, * *Ven-at-ъ*, * *Ven-ьl-ъ*, * *Ven-ъl-ъ* * *Ven-ol-ъ*, w zgermanizowanych postaciach: *Venedi*, *Vinidi*, *Venadi*, angsas. *Weonôd*, *Vi(n)nili*, *Vi(n)nuli*, *Vinoli*. Uzasadnienie poszczególnych form w SO V—IX według indeksów leksykograficznych, zwłaszcza SO IX 358 402.

Te dwa fakty językowe zdają się gwarantować, iż w okresie zjawienia się Indoeuropejczyków w zagłębiu Bałtyku dorzecze Wisły i Odry objęła ta ludność indoeuropejska, która z biegiem czasu rozwinęła się w dzisiejszych Polaków i Pomorzan.

Obszerniejsze przedstawienie zagadnienia ukaże się w wydawnictwie Akad. Fińskiej, w książce na cześć J. J. Mikkoli, Helsinki 1932.

W dyskusji zabierali głos Rozwadowski i Lehr-Spławiński.

4. J. Kuryłowicz (Lwów): **Polski gen.-acc. plur. męskoosobowy.**

Należy przypuszczać, że w dziedzinie t. zw. zjawisk analogji czyli asymilacji morfologicznej decydującą rolę odgrywa czynnik znaczeniowy. Ponieważ faktem jest, że nowotwór nie zastępuje formy starej odrazu we wszystkich jej użyciach, lecz wypiera ją zwolna, przyczem równoległe istnienie obu form trwać może i dziesiątki lat, przyjmujemy, że ten zmieniający się wciąż stan równowagi jest wykładnikiem pewnych zachodzących zmian semantycznych, obejmujących skalę od różnic gramatyczno-kategorjalnych do odcieni pozajęzykowych, jakoto walorów estetycznych (np. archaizmy w poezji) lub społecznych (np. język warstwy wykształconej).

Mechanizm asymilacji morfologicznej wytłumaczyć się daje łatwo przez proporcję. Przyczyną działania tego mechanizmu są czynniki semantyczne, ponieważ wogóle inowacje formalne muszą mieć oparcie semantyczne, tak jak przeciwnie zmiany znaczeniowe możliwe są tylko przy istniejących już różnicach formalnych (w najszerszem tego słowa znaczeniu, należy tu więc także nietylko konstelacja składniowa, ale i sytuacja zewnętrzna). Odcienie znaczeniowe, wyrażane do pewnej chwili zapomocą formuły niegramatycznej, jak np. sytuacja zewnętrzna, lub leksykalnie (np. zapomocą dodania wyrazu), mogą, dzięki utworzeniu formy proporcjonalnej, być wyrażone gramatycznie.

Z drugiej strony powstanie formy proporcjonalnej (analo-

gicznej) często, chociaż bynajmniej niezawsze, połączone bywa z wyparciem formy starej. Mamy tutaj do czynienia ze zjawiskiem podobnem jak we fonetyce. I tam także dźwięk powstały warunkowo utrwala się obok starego jako osobny fonem, albo wypiera go zupełnie ($A > A'$ albo $A' < A$ obok starego A). Te dwie kategorje zmian, zarówno morfologiczno-znaczeniowych, jak fonetycznych, dadzą się wytłumaczyć czynnikami pozajęzykowemi. Każda zmiana językowa ograniczona jest w czasie i przestrzeni. Jeżeli sąsiednie czy otaczające terytorjum [1], które jej pierwotnie nie zna, przejmuje ją przez naśladownictwo, z tą ekspansją terytorjalną będzie szła ręka w rękę ekspansja w obrębie systemu morfologicznego lub fonetycznego danego języka (zależnie od tego, czy chodzi o zmianę morfologiczno-znaczeniową czy też fonetyczną). Dzieje się to na mocy elementarnego prawa kontrastu:

Stan początkowy.

Terytorjum I: W pewnych określonych warunkach A′; pozatem A.

Terytorjum II: W tychże warunkach A; pozatem także A.

Zamiana A na A′, spowodowana przez naśladownictwo na terytorjum II, będzie miała tendencję do wyjścia poza określone warunki, ponieważ sprężyną tego naśladownictwa jest prestiż (kulturalny, polityczny, ekonomiczny i t. p.) terytorjum I. Porównaj np. tak zwane formy hiperpoprawne (które są niemi tylko wtedy, jeżeli istnieje jeszcze repartycja A ‖ A′ na terytorjum I i jeżeli język tego terytorjum uchodzi za normalny czy poprawny). Z czasem na terytorjum II A′ może wyprzeć zupełnie formę A. Po fazie zróżnicowania, jaka zaszła na terytorjum I, będziemy mieli fazę scałkowania na terytorjum II. Obie fazy razem dają zmianę kompletną. Znaczniejsze odległości czasowe i słaba dokumentacja przeważnie nie pozwalają nam na ustalenie obu faz zmiany kompletnej, szczególnie ważniejszej fazy pierwszej. Przy obfitej dokumentacji faza druga pojawia się jako suma faz drobnych i licznych, tak że dają wrażenie zjawiska ciągłego.

W konkretnym wypadku polskiego gen.-acc. plur. imion męskoosobowych trzeba przedewszystkiem postawić pytanie, czy zastąpienie formy *syny* przez *synów* jest zasadniczo zjawiskiem historycznem czy przedliterackiem. Jeżeli, jak zgodni są grama-

---

[1] Zamiast pojęcia grupy terytorjalnej możemy w następującym wywodzie użyć także ogólniejszego pojęcia grupy społecznej.

tycy (Kryński, Łoś, Szober, Drzewiecki w znanej monografji), zachodzi pierwsza alternatywa, należy doszukiwać się różnicy znaczeniowej obu form w zabytkach, które wykazują wahanie. Nasuwa się przytem przypuszczenie, że forma nowa (*synów*) służy do wyrażenia jednego z odcieni znaczeniowych, które pluralis męski posiada we wszystkich językach indoeuropejskich tworzących imiona męskie od żeńskich zapomocą mocji. Mianowicie pluralis męski oznacza nietylko zespół czysto męski, ale także zespół mieszany (t. j. złożony z osobników męskich i żeńskich), podczas gdy pluralis żeński oznacza tylko zespół czysto żeński. W językach indoeuropejskich zarówno starych jak nowych panuje np. reguła, że jeżeli podmiot jest grupą złożoną z rzeczowników męskich i żeńskich, odpowiedni przymiotnik (przydawka czy orzecznik) jest rodzaju męskiego. W języku polskim pluralis jak *grzesznicy* może się odnosić do mężczyzn i kobiet, ale nigdy tylko do kobiet (w tym ostatnim wypadku mówimy *grzesznice*). Pluralis *grzesznicy* posiada więc dwie wartości znaczeniowe. Jeżeli kontekst lub sytuacja zewnętrzna nie określają bliżej, z którą z nich mamy do czynienia w konkretnym wypadku, możemy uciec się do określenia leksykalnego, np. *grzesznicy i grzesznice* (w tym wypadku forma *grzesznicy* oznacza zespół czysto męski). Rozróżnienie takie może być zresztą często niepotrzebne (prawie zawsze w wypadku imion żywotnych nieosobowych).

Wzór liczby pojedyńczej (gen.-acc. *grzesznika*) nastręczał możliwość proporcjonalnego nowotworu dla acc. plur., czyli rozróżnienia w tym właśnie (i tylko w tym) przypadku obu wartości zapomocą dwóch odrębnych form: stary accusativus *grzeszniki* użyty został dla oddania wartości mieszanoosobowej, a nowy acc. (⟸ gen.) *grzeszników* dla wyrażenia wartości męskoosobowej (ponieważ sing. *grzesznika* oddaje tylko wartość męskoosobową). Pierwotne użycie form możnaby więc zilustrować następującemi przykładami: *Bóg pokarał grzeszniki* ale *Bóg pokarał grzeszników i grzesznice.* Późniejsze uogólnienie formy męskoosobowej *grzeszników* sprawia, że obecnie forma ta (jak pierwotnie, przed XV wiekiem, forma *grzeszniki*) znów posiada zarówno wartość męskoosobową jak i wartość mieszanoosobową. Słowem nastąpił zanik opozycji m i e s z a n o o s o b o w y : m ę s k o o s o b o w y jako opozycji kategorjalnej.

Powyższą hipotezę prelegent pragnąłby poddać do rozważenia

polonistom, ujmując zagadnienie w formę trzech pytań: 1) Czy użycie form *grzeszniki*: *grzeszników* w najstarszych zabytkach da się pogodzić z pojęciem wartości mieszanoosobowej dla pierwszej, męskoosobowej dla drugiej z nich? — 2) Jakie są kolejno po sobie następujące późniejsze przesunięcia znaczeniowe, sprawiające, że wkońcu forma pierwsza spada do roli archaizmu poetyckiego, a druga traci ekspresywność, obejmując obie wartości? — 3) Czy nowa forma *grzeszników* może być zlokalizowana, t. j. przypisana jakiejś określonej grupie lokalnej i wogóle społecznej? (Pytanie to ze względu na stosunkowo słabą dokumentację prawdopodobnie znaczenia nie posiada).

W związku z pytaniem pierwszem należy zauważyć, że w fazie pierwszej (różnicowania) często napotykamy formę starą zamiast nowej, ponieważ ta ostatnia jest silnie ekspresywna, a wartość męskoosobowa może być dana nieekspresywnie przez kontekst. W wypadkach, gdy już sam kontekst nasuwa wartość męskoosobową, forma stara, która dziedziczy oba znaczenia (znaczenie męskoosobowe traci ona dopiero z czasem przez przeciwstawienie się nowotworowi) w zupełności wystarcza. Mamy więc tutaj utrudniającą nam zadanie sytuację. Kontekst sugeruje znaczenie męskoosobowe, a użyta jest forma stara. — W fazie drugiej (całkowania) będziemy mieli zjawisko przeciwne. Tam forma męskoosobowa pojawi się i w wypadkach, gdzie z kontekstu jasno wynika znaczenie mieszanoosobowe, ponieważ repartycja pomału przesuwa się na korzyść formy nowej.

W dyskusji zabierał głos Nitsch.

5. S. Szober (Warszawa) zagaił dyskusję nad **systemem fonologicznym języka polskiego.** Brali w niej udział Nitsch, Rudnicki i Ułaszyn.

6. W. Doroszewski (Warszawa): **O elementy języka: głoski i fonemy.**

Nie można mówić o systemach, nie rozważywszy elementów. Brak analizy podstawowych pojęć mści się i doprowadza do zamętu, w którym kontury zagadnień są starte i nic nie reguluje luźnego, płynnego używania terminów. Zanim się będzie dyskutowało nad »systemami fonemów«, należy ustalić, czem ma być »fonem« jako element. Nie widać żadnej innej możliwej drogi.

Zasługuje na uwagę, że fonetycy, mający ciągle do czynienia z dźwiękami mowy, pojęcia dźwięku nie definjowali. Rousselot używa terminu *dźwięk* chwiejnie, czasem w znaczeniu subjektywnego wrażenia, wywołanego przez działającą na słuch podnietę zewnętrzną, kiedyindziej w znaczeniu wibracji fali powietrznej.

W jednem czy w drugiem znaczeniu termin *dźwięk* jest właściwie hipostazą, bo zdanie:» istnieją dźwięki« może znaczyć tylko: zdarza się, że ktoś coś słyszy (odpowiada to pierwszemu ujęciu Rousselota), albo: zdarza się, że ciała dźwięczą (drugie ujęcie Rousselota).

W ramach tej alternatywy zmieszczą się, zdaje się, wszystkie różnice teorjopoznawczych sformułowań, o co zresztą w tej chwili nie idzie[1]. W obu wypadkach przedmiotami są drgające sprężyste ciała lub odbiorcy wrażeń; na pojęcie dźwięku jako przedmiotu niema miejsca. Mówiąc o dźwięku, mówimy właściwie o działaniu czyjemś (jakiegoś ciała).

Uwaga językoznawcy winna się kierować nie na dźwięki jako »ideje« (przedmioty idealne), lecz na działaczy, na ludzi mówiących. Podstawą fonetyki jest fizjologja, nauka o charakterze przyrodniczym, doświadczalna, której nie można lekceważyć ani omijać na rzecz opisu »idej dźwiękowych«, »dźwięków-typów«, czy innych tego rodzaju skrótów.

Język jest działalnością społeczną, nie »faktem społecznym« w durkheimowsko-saussurowskiem rozumieniu.

»Przedmiotem« fonetyki są głośne artykulacje, dostępne w doświadczeniu tylko wówczas, gdy się obserwuje ludzi mówiących. Kładzenie nacisku na »wyobrażenia«, właściwe tendencjom psychologistycznym, w praktyce naukowej nie opłaca się, prowadzi do zamieszania.

Głośne artykulacje można badać ze stanowiska czysto fizjologicznego, albo też z uwzględnieniem ich funkcyj. Głoski (= głośne artykulacje) mogące służyć do różnicowania znaczeń można nazywać fonemami. Fonem jest to zatem zasadniczo głoska + pewna *differentia specifica*: przydatność funkcjonalna.

Istnieje fonetyka opisowa (zasadniczo doświadczalna, bo opierająca się na danych doświadczenia) i fonetyka funkcjonalna. Obie

[1] Fakt użycia przymiotnika »teorjopoznawczy« nie obowiązuje oczywiście mnie, ani zresztą kogokolwiek, do następnego angażowania się w metafizykę.

te dyscypliny zajmują się temi samemi »rzeczami«, tylko z różnych stanowisk. Na jakąś trzecią, pośrednią lub nadrzędną dyscyplinę niema miejsca.

Uwaga. Obszerniejszą pracę, poświęconą zagadnieniom naszkicowanym powyżej, drukuję gdzieindziej. Obecnie nie posługuję się rozróżnieniem terminologicznem *głoska—fonem.*

Dyskusja:

Rozwadowski: Szanuję wysiłek myślowy w wywodach i definicjach prof. Doroszewskiego, chciałbym jednak zaznaczyć, że nasze dążenie do uchwycenia 'prawdy życia' nigdy nie może uchwycić istoty zjawisk i dlatego wysiłek poznawczy musi się zawsze w jakimś punkcie zatrzymać, mianowicie w punkcie rzeczywistości, która jednak nie da się żadną jednoznaczną definicją określić. W przeciwnym razie popada się w metafizykę słowną. Przykładem tego są też nowoczesne roztrząsania i określenia podstawowych pojęć matematyki.

Prof. D. unikał pojęcia przedmiotu, mówił o aktywnościach. Przyzwyczailiśmy się rozróżniać dwa światy, fizyczny i psychiczny i trzeba tylko pamiętać, że to nie są naprawdę dwa różne światy, z których jeden jest materjalny, a drugi niby niematerjalny. Mamy do czynienia z nieskończonym szeregiem realności różnego rzędu. Głoska nie jest przedmiotem (rzeczą) w zwykłem znaczeniu tego wyrazu, ale nie jest zerem; mimo krótkiego trwania i ulotnej materjalności nie jest czemś bezcielesnem.

Zabierali też głos Nitsch, Ułaszyn, Szober i Rudnicki.

7. W. Doroszewski (Warszawa): **Kilka uwag o semantyce.**

Referat niniejszy ma cel poniekąd praktyczny: chodzi o ustalenie myśli przewodnich, któreby były pożyteczne dla konkretnej pracy w zakresie semantyki.

Zagadnienia semantyczne stanowią teren spotkania logika, psychologa i językoznawcy. Kategorje semantyczne logików wyrosły z rozmaitości elementów zdania: do jednej kategorji logiczno-semantycznej należą wyrazy, które dadzą się w zdaniu podstawiać jedne za drugie. Dla psychologa fakty językowe są zawsze tylko ilustracją pewnych praw psychicznych. Językoznawca musi wyjść od faktów językowych, one stanowią bezpośredni teren jego pracy. Żadnych praw psychicznych językoznawca nie powi-

nien zgóry zakładać, o wszelkich bowiem procesach psychicznych »przedjęzykowych« może on dowiadywać się tylko drogą pośredniego wnioskowania.

W gruncie rzeczy językoznawca, pracując w zakresie semantyki, bada nie »znaczenia wyrazów«, lecz użycia wyrazów. Słownik jest rejestrem użyć zanotowanych wyrazów i te użycia właśnie są ważne. Użycia zaś są aktami ludzi mówiących lub piszących.

Definjowanie terminu »znaczenie wyrazu« nie ma celu, bo samo to pojęcie nie jest dla językoznawcy czemś interesującem: zdanie »wyrazy znaczą« równa się zdaniu: »ludzie używają wyrazów i rozumieją się«. »Znaczeniom« wyrazów przysługuje taki sam rodzaj istnienia, jak głoskom: tu i tam chodzi o pewne aktywności (akty, działania, czyny) ludzkie.

Pierwszem zadaniem językoznawcy zwracającego się ku znaczeniowej stronie faktów językowych jest dokładny opis dzisiejszych użyć wyrazów. Wśród tych użyć jedne są całkowicie aktualne i żywe, inne już trochę wycierające się, inne zapominane, inne szczątkowe. Opis musi się z konieczności liczyć z tą chronologją: nie można oddzielić opisu od historji, semantyka językoznawcza musi być jednocześnie historyczną [1]).

Użycia wyrazów, gdy się uwzględni czynnik masy (mówiących) i czynnik czasu, wykazują pewne jednostajności. Są wypadki, masowo zaświadczone, typowego zapominania znaczeń wyrazów: są to wypadki, gdy ściera się strukturalne znaczenie wyrazu i gdy wyraz-formacja przeistacza się w wyraz-znak. W tym wypadku można określić terminami de Saussure'a: formy językowo umotywowane stają się językowo nieumotywowanemi. Zachodzi leksykalizacja formacyj. (Przykłady polskie

[1]) Na nieporozumieniu polegał zarzut, postawiony mi w dyskusji przez prof. Rozwadowskiego, jakobym wzorujac się na de Saussurze oddzielał całkowicie językoznastwo historyczne od opisowego i tem stwarzał pewne dydaktyczne niebezpieczeństwa. Jak widać chyba z powyższych zdań streszczenia, oddzielanie takie jest zupełnie sprzeczne z mojemi intencjami. Przeciw schematom de Saussure'a — i oczywiście także przeciw abstrakcyjnemu oddzielaniu »diachronji« i »synchronji« — występowałem w druku jeszcze parę lat temu (»Langue« et »parole« Prace Filolog. XIV, »Socjologja i filozofja Durkheima« Przegląd Filozof. XXXIII, z. 3). Wówczas de Saussure liczył jakgdyby miejscami więcej zwolenników i spotykały mnie zupełnie odmienne zarzuty.

zgrupowałem — w małej części — w IV rozdziale »Monografij słowotwórczych«). Jest to zjawisko powszechne, występujące w różnych językach.

»Kąt« między strukturalnem a doraźnem znaczeniem wyrazu stanowi najważniejsze »widły« semantyczne potrzebne językoznawcy (to była m. i. myśl przewodnia moich »Monografij słowotwórczych«). Zanik — lub osłabienie — produktywności sufiksów, które można historycznie stwierdzić w języku polskim, ma szersze tło, a tem tłem jest prawo (ten wyraz nie jest tu przesadnym) leksykalizacji.

Bez historji niema językoznawczej semantyki, w rozważaniach zaś historycznych najpewniejsza wytyczna prowadzi od znaczeń strukturalnych do doraźnych znaczeń dzisiejszych.

Etymologja — słowotwórstwo — semantyka, są to dziedziny najściślej ze sobą zespolone. Bez uporządkowanego słowotwórstwa nie może być uporządkowanej semantyki.

Dyskusja:

Rozwadowski: Nie w formie zarzutu, tylko raczej przestrogi chciałbym zaznaczyć, że diachronja i synchronja to nie jakieś dwa odrębne światy, a tylko dwa aspekty węzłowej jedności. W konkretnej wypowiedzi, a konkretnem, jednorazowem użyciu wyrazów mamy dwa momenty, mianowicie na podstawie tradycyjnej, powszechnej wartości (znaczenia) wyrazów realizuje się to, co w danej chwili ma się na myśli, czyli nowy, aktualny (sytuacyjny) odcień treściowy, bardzo rozmaitego zresztą charakteru.

Rozróżniać jasno aspekty zjawiska jest rzeczą pożyteczną i potrzebną, ale rozrywać jedność jest rzeczą zgubną.

Program zjazdu sierpniowego (1931) w Genewie rozróżnia wyrazy umotywowane i nieumotywowane (Bally) i jest skłonny przyznać wyższość nieumotywowanym. Wydaje mi się to przewracaniem wszystkiego. Mowa zmierza do wytworzenia doskonałych, jednoznacznych znaków i dochodzi do nich wcześniej czy później, nie dla wszystkich treści oczywiście naraz i na różnych drogach.

8. H. Willman-Grabowska (Kraków): **Zdanie w indoirańskiem** (na podstawie tekstów wedyjskich, staroperskich i awestyjskich).

Pojedyncze zdania niezależne, stanowiące całość w sobie, są raczej rzadkie. Właściwe są pewnym sposobom mówienia, pewnym rodzajom stylu i służą do celów, które łatwo można ująć i określić, np. rozporządzenia, zwięzłe sprawozdania (cf. napisy staroperskie itd.). Zwykły typ języka piśmiennego, a który zapewne niewiele odbiegał od mowy ustnej, jest to szereg zdań równorzędnych, połączonych zapomocą odpowiedniej partykuły lub nie. Pod tym względem różnice między tekstami są dość znaczne.

Parataksa jest najczęściej kwestją formy. W gruncie rzeczy bywa ona hipotaksą, która nie znalazła jeszcze dla siebie odpowiednich sposobów wyrażenia podrzędności. Wcześnie jednak daje się już skonstatować istnienie hipotaksy gramatycznej obok parataksy formalnej.

Pierwszy kształt zdania podrzędnego to zdanie relatywne, dopowiedzenie. Ma się wrażenie, jakoby dany wyraz (pojęcie) nie wydawał się dostatecznie wyjaśniony, pomimo kontekstu, i że autor wraca do pojęcia już wypowiedzianego, szukając dla niego jeszcze dokładniejszego lub dodatkowego określenia. Przyczyną takich powrotów myślowych jest trudność, z jaką umysł niewyćwiczony zdaje sobie sprawę z tego, co właściwie zamierza powiedzieć. Jest nią również ubóstwo słownikowe, brak ścisłych wyrażeń, a nawet poprostu nazw (cf. obfitość metafor w mowie ludowej, w mowie ludów t. zw. pierwotnych itd.).

Staroindyjski język zaradził względnemu ubóstwu słownika przez tworzenie złożeń rzeczownikowych, przymiotnikowych. Gdy język st.-ind. z przyczyn sobie właściwych zatrzymał się w swym rozwoju, zmysł syntezy, rozwijając się dalej, stworzył dla siebie odpowiednią formę. Języki irańskie (cf. pers. i awest.), które nie rozporządzały tak obfitym materjałem intelektualnym ani lingwistycznym, obrały inną z tendencyj ukrytych w indoirańskiem.

Od początku musiały istnieć odcienie znaczeniowe między poszczególnemi zdaniami »relatywnemi«. Ale zanim stały się dokładnie widoczne, zdanie »relatywne« ustaliło się już w pewnym kształcie niezmiennym. Dalszy rozwój treści zdołał jedynie spowodować rozszerzenie znaczenia demonstratywno-relatywnego zaimka *$\underset{\frown}{i}$o*. Gdy kategorja pojęcia czasu przenikała coraz bardziej do kategorji czynności wyrażanej przez słowo, zdanie czasownikowe

okazało się bardziej odpowiedniem niż nominalne do wyrażenia jakiegobądź procesu; rozrastając się coraz więcej, powodowało ono formowanie liczniejszych zdań podrzędnych.

Tak więc ewolucja zdania szła od parataksy ku hipotaksie i od kategorji nominalnej do kategorji werbalnej (prócz nielicznych poszczególnych wyjątków jak np. w st.-indyjskiem).

W dyskusji zabierał głos Kuryłowicz.

Sprawozdanie kasowe przyjęto. W miejsce ustępujących w myśl statutu członków Zarządu: J. Kuryłowicza (Lwów), K. Nitscha (Kraków) i S. Słońskiego (Warszawa) wybrano W. Doroszewskiego (Warszawa), W. Taszyckiego (Lwów) i J. Ziłyńskiego (Kraków). Zarząd na posiedzeniu dn. 24. maja wybrał prezesem Towarzystwa S. Szobera (Warszawa), wiceprezesem T. Lehra-Spławińskiego (Kraków), sekretarzem W. Doroszewskiego (Warszawa), skarbnikiem ponownie H. Osterreichera (Kraków).

II

Członkowie Towarzystwa.

1. Członkowie zmarli:

Appel Karol † 16. III. 1930.
Baudouin de Courtenay Jan † 3. XI. 1929.
Gawroński Andrzej † 11. I. 1927.
Łoś Jan † 10. XI. 1928.
Porzeziński Wiktor † 12. III. 1929.

2. Członkowie w r. 1931.

Altbauer Mojżesz, Wilno.
Bajkin Wsewołod, Wilno.
Benni Tytus, Warszawa.
Birkenmajer Józef, Warszawa.
Chomiński Olgierd, Wilno.
Dollmayr Wiktor, Lwów.
Doroszewski Witold, Warszawa.
Dyboski Roman, Kraków.
Dziech Józef, Poznań.
Gaertner Henryk, Lwów.
Glixelli Stefan, Wilno.
Gołębiewski Kazimierz, Toruń.
Górska Helena, Poznań.
Grabowska-Willmanowa Helena, Kraków.
Janów Jan, Lwów.

Jaworek Piotr, Kraków.
Kleczkowski Adam, Poznań.
Klemensiewicz Zenon, Kraków.
Klich Edward, Poznań.
Koschmieder Erwin, Wilno.
Kotwicz Władysław, Lwów.
Kowalski Tadeusz, Kraków.
Krokiewicz Adam, Warszawa.
Kryński Adam, Warszawa.
Kubica Stefan, Poznań.
Kuraszkiewicz Władysław, Kraków.
Kuryłowicz Jerzy, Lwów.
Lehr-Spławiński Tadeusz, Kraków.
Łaszewski Stefan, Warszawa.
Łempicki Zygmunt, Warszawa.
Małecki Mieczysław, Kraków.
Maślak Tomasz, Toruń.
Milewski Tadeusz, Kraków.
Moroń Bogusław, Ostrów Wielkopolski.
Moszyński Kazimierz, Kraków.
Nitsch Kazimierz, Kraków.
Obrębska Antonina, Kraków.
Oesterreicher Henryk, Kraków.
Ohienko Iwan, Warszawa.
Otrębski Jan, Wilno.
Passendorfer Artur, Lwów.
Paulisz Zygmunt, Garwolin.
Pfanhauserowa Stefanja, Warszawa.
Piekarski Kazimierz, Warszawa.
Pilatowa Janina, Lwów.
Rozwadowski Jan, Kraków.
Rudnicki Mikołaj, Poznań.
Rudzińska Marja, Warszawa.
Safarewicz Jan, Wilno.
Schultheiss Tassilo, Berlin.
Słoński Stanisław, Warszawa.
Słuszkiewicz Eugenjusz, Lwów.
Stein Ignacy, Poznań.
Stieber Zdzisław, Kraków.
Suchý Kamil, Kraków.
Szober Stanisław, Warszawa.
Śmieszek Antoni, Poznań.
Świderska-Koneczna Halina, Warszawa.
Taszycki Witold, Lwów.
Tomaszewski Adam, Poznań.
Turska Halina, Wilno.
Ułaszyn Henryk, Poznań.
Wędkiewicz Stanisław, Kraków.
Wieczorkiewicz Bronisław, Warszawa.
Witkowski Stanisław, Lwów.
Ziłyński Iwan, Kraków.
Żarnowiecki Jan, Wilno.

SPIS RZECZY. — TABLE DES MATIÈRES: